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INTRODUCTION

1.1 Segregation problematic and research objectives

For several years, the prevention and abatement of (spatial) segregation on the basis of income and ethnic identity have been high on the Dutch political agenda. Local authorities and the larger cities have been combating physical and socio-economic decline in certain districts with varying degrees of success. The national government has become convinced of the need to tackle segregation in many urban areas. Besides mounting an offensive against the causes of social marginalization, housing policies are also considered key. Yet the possibilities and limitations of using housing to combat segregation have not been demonstrated.

The problems of deprived areas are certainly not unique to the Netherlands. Other cities in Europe and elsewhere have encountered these problems, many to a larger degree. Most often, policy is geared to prevent differences between neighbourhoods and among population groups from growing.

The local authority of The Hague and the Ministry of Housing (VROM - Housing, Spatial Planning, and the Environment) met to explore the options. They have taken the initiative to set up an international exchange of experiences with regard to the opportunities and limitations of policy—particularly housing policy—as an instrument to prevent or reduce spatial segregation in the city and region.

The objective of this study is to find out what the experiences of the Netherlands and other countries can teach us about this problem. Two research institutes—AME (Amsterdam study centre for the Metropolitan Environment, at the University of Amsterdam) and OTB (Research Institute for Housing, Urban and Mobility Studies, at Delft University of Technology)—conducted a comparative study of this problem. The study covers six European cities and their agglomerations: The Hague, Barcelona, Birmingham, Brussels, Frankfurt, and Lille. The investigators asked several key informants in those European cities for information that could shed light on the following questions:

1. What general economic and demographic trends are involved in the emergence and the abatement of segregation? How is the welfare state structured?
2. To what extent has that structure recently been undergoing change?
3. To what extent is segregation seen as a problem by policy-makers at the national
regional, and local level? In what direction is the perception of segregation as a problem developing?

3. To what extent does segregation on the grounds of socio-economic position and ethnic identity occur within the city and between the city and its hinterland? How does the phenomenon of segregation develop at the local and the regional level?

4. What kind of policy is implemented at the national, regional, and local level to combat segregation? To what extent are instruments used to buttress the economic structure, to offer training, to promote employment, to carry out physical planning, to revitalize the cities? What are the effects of those policies?

5. What specific instruments of housing policy are implemented to combat segregation? What are the (expected) effects?

This case-study focuses on the city of Birmingham and its surrounding West Midlands region. The case studies on the other five European cities will be reported in other issues of this book series.

We take segregation to mean the occurrence of spatial dividing lines separating areas in which there are large differences in the proportion of underprivileged groups in the population. As key indicators we take the variables of income, unemployment and ethnic background. In principle, we distinguish two levels of scale. The first level is of the district (Dutch equivalent is ‘wijk’; in the Hague the average population of ‘wijk’ is about 13,500). The second is the level of the central city relative to the agglomeration.

1.2 The Birmingham case

With a population of around one million people, Birmingham is the United Kingdom’s largest provincial city. Located in the West Midlands, Birmingham’s urban region consists of seven districts\(^\text{1}\) and a combined population of more than 2.5 million people. This area possesses the United Kingdom’s oldest and largest concentration of manufacturing industry.

The decline of the traditional manufacturing industry initiated the end of a long era of growth in both the population and prosperity of Birmingham. The movement of employment and people to smaller regional towns further damaged the economy. A growing number of people in the city became unemployed and forced to live under a minimum living standard.

The UK conservative government attempted to revive the economy and liveability of its cities through a market approach and a reorganisation of the local government. In Birmingham this approach led to the initiation of large projects aiming at new industrial activity and an increasing business and leisure industry. In an attempt to

\(^{1}\) The seven districts which make up the urban region of Birmingham are: Coventry, Dudley, Sandwell, Walsall, Wolverhampton, Solihull and the city of Birmingham.
diversify the employment structure and to attract new investment into the city, some key attractions have been developed. The most significant is the ‘NEC-group’, consisting of the National Exhibition Centre, the International Convention Centre, the National Indoor Arena, and the Symphony Hall. Most development projects could not have been realised without successful local claims to European Community funds.

In spite of these achievements there are still many problems. Unemployment in Birmingham remains above the national average. According to the Department of the Environment, Birmingham is one of the most deprived areas in the country. In addition, there are growing socio-economic disparities between affluent suburban communities with high quality housing, and poor inner-city communities with an older, run-down housing stock.

Under the Conservative administrations between 1979 and 1997, English housing policy has been based on a liberal market philosophy. Emphasis has been placed on the stimulation of home-ownership and a higher selectivity in state support. The ‘right to buy’ policy, which gave residents of rental dwellings the right and the incentives to buy their house, has led to a concentration of the poorest households (those who can not afford to buy their house) in the social housing sector. Poverty is not confined to this sector, however, but has spread out amongst home-owners. The inclusion of a case-city in Great Britain is particularly interesting since, in the eyes of many, Dutch housing policy is presently going through the similar transition of housing market liberalisation, although at a much slower pace.

Spatial segregation is not considered to be an important topic of policy interference in Great Britain. However deprivation has featured on the policy agenda. Concentrations of deprivation have been a target for policy, although there is no implication that segregation is seen as problematic, as long as it is not associated with deprivation. While no deliberate desegregation efforts were found, many different initiatives in the field of urban regeneration may have a similar effect in reducing or preventing segregation, and should therefore be mentioned here.

This report is structured as follows: firstly, the occurrence of socio-economic and ethnic spatial segregation in the city of Birmingham and within the larger urban region will be illustrated (chapter 2), followed by a description of the underlying causes of segregation in Birmingham and in the larger urban region (chapter 3). The subsequent chapter 4 describes the British policy of urban regeneration and some examples of its implementation in Birmingham, which is followed by a brief summary and conclusion (chapter 5).
SEGREGATION IN BIRMINGHAM AND THE WEST MIDLANDS

2.1 Introduction

The urban region of Birmingham covers about 950 square kilometres and consists of seven districts, of which the city of Birmingham is the largest. Until 1986 this area formed the West Midlands county. A more appropriate term for this area today would be the West Midlands conurbation: a collection of towns and cities, without reference to a dominant position of the city of Birmingham. In 1989, the conurbation counted approximately 2.5 million inhabitants, half of the population of the total West Midlands region.

Three official levels for the presentation of Census data have been laid down for the entire United Kingdom. The first level is the district. The next level is the ward, with an average population size of 10,000. There are 163 wards in the West Midlands region and 39 in Birmingham itself. The lowest census level is the Enumeration District (ED). These have an average population of 500. The urban region of Birmingham is divided into 5367 ED's of which 2085 ED's make up the city of Birmingham. Figures 2.1 and 2.2 illustrate the relative size and location of the seven metropolitan districts of the West Midlands conurbation and the relative size and location of the 39 wards of Birmingham city respectively.

In the subsequent sections of this chapter, the variables 'income', 'unemployment', and 'ethnicity' will be presented on the ward-level. It is important to bear in mind that smaller pockets of deprivation do not become visible on this level, but demand an analysis on the smaller level of the Enumeration District. Because of the lack of data-availability on this smaller spatial scale, such an analyses can not be conducted for all of the above variables.

2.2 Socio-economic segregation

2.2.1 Income

The UK census, which runs once every ten years, does not include an income variable. Therefore it is very difficult to illustrate spatial segregation in Birmingham through this indicator. A proxy measure for mean earnings at ward level has been
created from different sources by the University of Birmingham. Unfortunately this exercise has been conducted only for 1991. Therefore it is not possible to make longitudinal comparisons.

Figure 2.3 illustrates the estimate of ward level mean earnings for the West Midlands. Low earning levels are concentrated in the centre of Birmingham and in the wards bordering the centre on the west and east sides. A few other clusters of low earning levels are located in the centre of the Coventry district in the south-eastern section of the region, as well as in the districts Sandwell, Wolverhampton, and a small section of Walsall.

In general the wards with the lowest levels of mean earnings make up a continuous belt which extends from the mid-eastern part of Birmingham towards the north-west of the region. With the exception of the four wards located in the centre of Coventry, the eastern and southern sections of the region are characterised by a relatively high mean earning level.

There are two explanations for the location of the low-income belt. The first relates

---

2 The method involved matching occupational classifications in the census to the average weekly earnings for matched occupational groups published in the New Earnings Survey (1991) provided for by the Department of Employment. The data were standardised to take into account differentials according to sex and part-time and full-time earnings and the unemployed or those on Government Schemes.
Figure 2.2 The 39 wards of Birmingham

1 Sutton Four Oaks 15 Hodge Hill
2 Sutton New Hall 16 Washwood Heath
3 Sutton Vesey 17 Shard End
4 Oscott 18 Ladywood
5 Kingstanding 19 Edgbaston
6 Perry Barr 20 Yardley
7 Stockland Green 21 Harborne
8 Erdington 22 Quinton
9 Sandwell 23 Small Heath
10 Kingsbury 24 Sparkbrook
11 Aston 25 Sheldon
12 Handsworth 26 Acocks Green
13 Soho 27 Bartley Green
14 Nechells 28 Moseley
29 Sparkhill
30 Wooly
31 Fox Hollies
32 Selly Oak
33 Hall Green
34 Bournville
35 Billesley
36 Brandwood
37 Northfield
38 Longbridge
39 King’s Norton

To economic change and is particularly associated with the decline of traditional industries, especially associated with metals and engineering. The economic changes from the mid 70s through the end of the 80s had a particular impact on these industries in these areas. The other explanation is to do with the structure of the housing market and house prices. The properties in these areas less expensive and have always been accessible to lower income groups, especially immigrant groups, and consequently have tended to house those who are most prone to unemployment.
Other characteristics of the districts in the low-income belt (Birmingham, Sandwell, Walsall and Wolverhampton) are a high level of employees in employment, a low level of self-employed, a higher than the average regional share of manufacturing employees (in particular in Sandwell and Walsall), a below average regional share of services employees, a relatively low rate of part-time employees and a relatively low economic activity rate. In addition, they have a relatively high share of households with no car and with no central heating.

The private housing share in 1995 was below the regional average of 74.8 percent, whereas local authority housing is overrepresented in these districts (Government Office for the West Midlands, 1997).

**Income and ethnicity**

By using country of origin or ethnic group as an indicator for areas of disadvantage, the deprivation experienced by ethnic minorities has been taken into consideration in resource allocation since the 1981 census. Over the past decade, however, there has been a tendency to reduce the weighting given to ethnic minority variables in resource allocation. For instance, in the construction of the Index of Local Conditions, which is used by the Department of the Environment (DoE) to identify deprived areas in the UK, the ethnic minority variable was left out. The reason
behind the declining importance of this variable is the diverging experience of different ethnic groups which, according to policy-makers, makes it generally weaker in predicting poverty. However, in the example of the DoE index, the omission of the ethnic minority variable has affected resource allocations for many inner-city areas with high concentrations of ethnic minority groups. Doubts expressed by several respondents about the fairness of the DoE index indicate the need for detailed information on the relation between low-income and ethnicity.

The University of Oxford’s Social Disadvantage Group submitted a research proposal to the Joseph Rowntree Foundation in September 1996 entitled: “The relationship between poverty, ethnicity and the inner city by mapping and investigating the spatial distribution and concentration of low income ethnic minority households across Birmingham”. The applicants have decided to use the Housing Benefit/Council Tax Benefit data of 1995 as a direct measure of low income. This data set contains details of people who claim income support and housing benefit. It includes people in ‘bed and breakfast’ accommodation and hostels, but also owner-occupiers, as they have an obligation to pay council tax, and, if on income support, will be entitled to council tax benefit to cover their obligation. Similarly there are details of those who, while not entitled to income support, are in low paid work or for another reason have a low income and therefore claim either Housing Benefit or Council Tax Benefit. Other data sets, such as a postcoded pupil data base from the Local Education Authority, which holds information on free school meals, will enable small area analysis of low income.

The purpose of this study is to link these data sets to the ethnic minority variable of the 1991 census so to map the distribution of low income among different ethnic minority groups, to compare these with the distributions of the groups in the local population and to map the proportions of the various ethnic minority groups dependent on benefit.

The above example illustrates efforts to examine variables which have a high correlation to income level, and can thus serve as useful substitutes. By comparing the figures 2.3 and 2.9 (which shows the distribution of the non-white population in the West Midlands conurbation, p. 19) it is possible to draw some preliminary conclusions on the relationship between income and ethnicity. There is a partial overlap between the areas of low income and the areas with a large non-white population. Almost all of the wards with the lowest earning levels (the darkest shade in figure 2.3) are also characterised by a large share of non-white population (the darkest shade in figure 2.9). There are some wards (approximately seven) with low earning levels, for instance in the east of Birmingham, which have a low share of non-white population. In addition, some of the wards with a large non-white population are located in areas with medium or high earning levels.

2.2.2 Unemployment
Twenty different indicators of social and material deprivation have been identified from the UK Census data by the Birmingham City Council for the publication of their 1991 census topic report ‘Deprivation and Disadvantage’. Apart from
'unemployment', some of these other indicators are: households with no earned income (pensioners, disabled), overcrowding, lack of central heating, lack of basic housing amenities and limiting long term illness. This section will be limited to a presentation of the variable 'unemployment'.

The Birmingham Economic Information Centre gives a monthly update of unemployment figures for the Birmingham wards and the region's districts, which allows us to make longitudinal comparisons.

A remark should be made in regard to the use of the indicator 'unemployment'. Economically inactive people are not included in UK unemployment figures. As a result, unemployment is under-represented in traditional coal mine areas such as the West Midlands’ Black Country. Many older workers, after losing their jobs, have entered a long term dependency on state benefits and are not considered 'unemployed'.

In 1997, 11.9 percent of the population of Birmingham was unemployed. Three inner-city wards had an unemployment rate (over) 2 times the Birmingham rate: Aston, Handsworth and Sparkbrook. The highest unemployment rate is 2.4 times the average urban rate.

**Figure 2.4** Unemployment rates for the adult population (Jan. 1997), Birmingham city, ward level

Source: Economic Development Department, 1997
Figure 2.4 shows that the highest rates of unemployment are found in the inner city wards. It is questionable, however, whether all of these inner-city wards have uniformly high unemployment levels. More detailed employment rates at the ED level from the 1991 census topic report ‘Deprivation and Disadvantage’, indicate that the inner-city wards did not have uniformly high unemployment levels. Some parts of the city centre had rates below the city average, and there were pockets of very high unemployment in some outer wards, particularly in the south west of the city. Unfortunately, data on the level of the enumeration districts are not available for 1997. It is likely, however, that similar conclusions would be found.

The development of unemployment 1981-1997

Inequalities between wards have increased between 1981 and 1991. The wards having the lowest levels of unemployment saw a further reduction, whilst the worst affected wards have higher figures in 1991 compared to 1981 (1991 census topic report). The image of a widening gap between the wards, and a growing divide between the most deprived areas and the more affluent parts of the city, is supported by Lee and Murie. Their study, ‘Poverty, Housing Tenure and Social Exclusion’ (forthcoming) shows that in 1991, more wards had unemployment rates of less than

Figure 2.5 The development of unemployment by ward-level (1991-1997), Birmingham

10 percent than in 1981. In 1991, the highest rate (32.6%) was a factor of 2.3 times the urban average. Two wards registered more than 30 percent unemployed (Aston and Sparkbrook). In 1981, no wards had this level of unemployment.

Figure 2.5 indicates the evolution of unemployment between 1991 and December 1996. All of the wards have witnessed a decline in unemployment during this period. Since the unemployment levels were still rising until 1994 (Census topic report) this improvement has set in only recently. Even in the wards south-west of the centre, which experienced the largest increases in the number of unemployed until 1994, the trend has reversed. The positive development over a longer time period, however, does not show declining inequalities between the wards. Also the wards which already had low levels of unemployment in 1991 experienced a further decline. The highest rate in 1997 (28.6%) is a factor of 2.4 times the urban average, which is just higher than the 1991 rate of 2.3 times.

The West Midlands

The distribution of wards with a high unemployment level in the West Midlands region shows a very similar pattern compared to the distribution of low levels of mean weekly household earnings in the region. Once again a belt is visible, stretching out from the mid-eastern section of Birmingham towards the north-west of

Figure 2.6 Unemployment in the West Midlands (1991)
Table 2.1 Unemployment in the West Midlands 1981-1991-1996*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District name</th>
<th>Unemployed 1981 (%)</th>
<th>Unemployed 1991 (%)</th>
<th>Unemployed Dec. 1996 (%)</th>
<th>Index of growth (1991 = 100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwell</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solihull</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsall</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolverhampton</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Midlands County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


the region. The eastern half of the region, with the exception of the centre of Coventry, has relatively low levels of unemployment.

Table 2.1 shows the development of unemployment between 1981 and 1996.3 Birmingham is the only district in the county where unemployment levels still increased until 1991. The city, however, has also experienced a decline in the share of unemployed between 1991 and 1996. In 1996, the share of unemployed in Birmingham remained above the regional and the national level (9.5% and 7.4% respectively). Two other districts in the region, Sandwell and Wolverhampton, have a higher than the average regional unemployment rate. The unemployment in two of the region’s districts--Dudley and Solihull--is below the national unemployment rate. Birmingham has experienced the smallest decline in the share of unemployed. Thus the city’s decreasing unemployment does not indicate a declining socio-economic segregation on the regional level. The entire region benefits from the improved national economic climate, but the areas which had the highest unemployment in 1991 seem to benefit the least.

Unemployment and ethnicity

Members of black and ethnic minority populations have suffered a disproportionate level of unemployment, since their employment situation is traditionally linked to the availability of unskilled and semi-skilled work in the declining manufacturing industry.

Figure 2.7 illustrates the unemployment rates for selected ethnic groups in 1991. Unemployment amongst black and Asian men was nearly double the rate for white men in 1991. Unemployment amongst black and Chinese women is almost double,

---

3 The 1991 ward level statistics are brought in line with ward boundaries that were in effect at the time of the Census of Population in 1981. The 1996 ward level statistics are brought in line with ward boundaries that were in effect at the time of the Census of Population in 1991.
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and among Asian women more than triple the rate for white women (Ethnic Groups in Birmingham, 1991). The unemployment rates are highest for the Pakistani and Bangladeshi populations. Just over 35 percent of economically active Pakistani men, and 45 percent of Pakistani women were unemployed in 1991, against an urban average of 14.2 percent. The overall unemployment rate for Bangladeshi was 42 percent in 1991.

2.3 Ethnicity

The information on ethnicity has been derived from a 1991 census topic report 'Ethnic Groups in Birmingham', published by the Birmingham City Council. The 1991 census, for the first time included a question on respondents' ethnic origin. Respondents could self-classify themselves under one of ten 'ethnic origin' categories (figure 2.7). The Census of the population of 1981, however, did not include this question. Respondents were only asked for their country of birth. Because a longitudinal comparison is therefore hindered, this section is restricted to the presentation of ethnic segregation in 1991.

The West Midlands, after London, has the highest concentration of minority ethnic residents in Great Britain today. Ethnic minorities form 21.5 percent of Birmingham's population. The breakdown of ethnic minority groups is indicated in table 2.2.

Figure 2.7 Unemployment by ethnic group (1991), Birmingham

Explanation ethnic groups:
1: White
2: Black-Caribbean
3: Black-African
4: Black-other
5: Indian
6: Pakistani
7: Bangladeshi
8: Chinese
9: Other-Asian
10: Other-other
11: Total

Source: UK Census, 1991
The largest ethnic groups are Pakistani (6.9%), Indian (5.3%), and Black Caribbean (4.7%). Noteworthy is the lack of a single dominant ethnic group in Birmingham. Figure 2.8 illustrates the geographical concentrations of Birmingham’s ethnic minority groups by ward. An analysis of the figures for Birmingham highlights spatial concentrations of ethnic minority groups. 57.3 percent of Birmingham’s ethnic minority population is to be found in 7 of the 39 city-wards, which are concentrated as two big ‘lungs’ around the city centre: one north-west of the centre and the other one south-east of the centre. More than half of the population of these seven wards is made up of people from black and other ethnic minority groups.

The census topic report further illustrates that the most significant concentrations of black ethnic groups are to the north-west, west and south of the city centre. Indians are concentrated to the north-west of the city centre, with smaller concentrations in the west and to the south-east of the city-centre. Concentrations of Pakistani are to the east and south-east of the city centre, with a smaller concentration to the north and north-west.

Indices of segregation and of dissimilarity

In his study “Does Britain have ghettos?”, C. Peach has calculated the segregation scores and the scores of dissimilarity of the British cities with the largest immigrant populations.

Table 2.2 Ethnic group of residents in Birmingham (1991)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>754,274</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>44,770</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-African</td>
<td>2,803</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-Other</td>
<td>8,803</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>51,075</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>66,085</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>12,739</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>3,315</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-Other</td>
<td>5,653</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Other</td>
<td>11,524</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>961,041</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1991 Census
The Index of Dissimilarity measures the distribution of two different populations over the same subset of residential areas of a city. The values indicate the percentage of one group which would have to move to another area in order to achieve an identical distribution with the group with which it is being compared (Peach, 1995). The Index of Segregation measures the relationship between one group and the rest of the population.

The segregation indices and the indices of dissimilarity in table 2.3 have been calculated both on the ward and the ED-level. On the basis of these scores the following conclusions can be drawn: Of the black and ethnic minority populations in Birmingham, the Bangladeshi population has the highest segregation score (68), followed by the Pakistani population (66). Similarly, both groups have the highest Indices of Dissimilarity (67 and 62 respectively).

The segregation indices and the Indices of dissimilarity for all population groups are higher on the level of the enumeration district. Thus, as the size of the area decreases, the degree of ethnic minority dominance of the most concentrated areas increases.
Table 2.3  Ethnic Segregation Indices and Indices of Dissimilarity (1991), by ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Segregation Index</th>
<th>Index of Dissimilarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward-level</td>
<td>ED-level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afro Caribbean</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Black</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish born</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Peach, 1995, University of Manchester Computer Centre

Table 2.4 shows the highest ID-scores between different ethnic groups in Birmingham. The Bangladeshi and the Pakistani populations are the most segregated from the white population group. The lowest ID-score is between these two Asian groups: Bangladeshi versus Pakistani have an ID-score of 33 (Peach, 1995), which indicates that they are more likely to cluster together than any of the other population groups.

Table 2.4 Highest scores on Index of Dissimilarity (1991), by ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population-groups</th>
<th>ID-scores, ward level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi versus White</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani versus White</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi versus Irish</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White versus Indian</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Peach 1995, UMCC

4 The index-scores show very similar results when ‘birthplace’ is used instead of ‘ethnicity’ (Peach 1995).
Black and minority ethnic groups in the larger urban region

The Midlands, and in particular the urban region of Birmingham, has one of the highest concentrations of ethnic minorities in the country. Of the fourteen districts of the West and East Midlands with the largest local concentrations of people from ethnic minority groups, five were situated in the larger urban region of Birmingham: Birmingham, Wolverhampton, Sandwell, Coventry and Walsall were respectively on the second, third, fourth, fifth and eighth place (Owen & Johnson in Radcliffe, 1996).

Table 2.5 shows the details of ethnic group of residents of all the districts in the West Midlands conurbation. The ‘white’ group made up 85.4 percent of the regional population. Birmingham has the lowest proportion of ‘whites’ (78.5%) and Solihull has the largest ‘white’ population (97.1%). The Black-Caribbean group has the highest representation in Wolverhampton and Birmingham. The proportion of Indians amongst the total population is highest in Wolverhampton, Sandwell and Coventry. The Pakistani and Bangladeshis are most strongly represented in Birmingham. Figure 2.9 illustrates ward level concentrations of ethnic minority groups. Large concentrations of ethnic minority groups are located in the central Birmingham area and in the bordering wards in the districts of Sandwell and

Table 2.5 Details of ethnic group of residents (1991), West Midland districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Birmingham</th>
<th>Coventry</th>
<th>Dudley</th>
<th>Sandwell</th>
<th>Solihull</th>
<th>Walsall</th>
<th>Wolverhampton</th>
<th>Total W. Midlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>754,274</td>
<td>259,513</td>
<td>290,953</td>
<td>247,486</td>
<td>194,054</td>
<td>234,694</td>
<td>197,175</td>
<td>2,178,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-Caribbean</td>
<td>44,770</td>
<td>3,288</td>
<td>2,428</td>
<td>7,826</td>
<td>1,472</td>
<td>2,426</td>
<td>9,973</td>
<td>72,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-African</td>
<td>2,803</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>4,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-other</td>
<td>8,803</td>
<td>1,111</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>15,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>51,075</td>
<td>21,562</td>
<td>4,092</td>
<td>22,879</td>
<td>1,873</td>
<td>12,156</td>
<td>27,722</td>
<td>141,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>66,085</td>
<td>3,856</td>
<td>4,265</td>
<td>5,495</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>6,102</td>
<td>1,991</td>
<td>88,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>12,739</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>2,222</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>18,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>3,315</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>6,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Asian</td>
<td>5,653</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>8,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Other</td>
<td>11,524</td>
<td>1,604</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>1,568</td>
<td>18,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>961,041</td>
<td>294,387</td>
<td>304,615</td>
<td>290,091</td>
<td>199,859</td>
<td>259,488</td>
<td>242,190</td>
<td>2,551,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census, 1991
Figure 2.9 Percentage of non-white population by ward (1991), West Midlands region
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Dudley. Three other areas of concentration are located in the central and northern section of Coventry in the south-east of the region, in Wolverhampton, and in the south-western section of Walsall in the north-west of the region. In the majority of these areas, the concentration of ethnic minority groups coincides with the concentration of high unemployment and low incomes.

Segregation in the West Midlands

Owen and Johnson (1996) calculated the geographical segregation by ethnic group for 14 local authority districts in the entire Midlands area with the largest concentrations of people belonging to an ethnic minority group. These include five of the seven districts of the West Midlands conurbation (table 2.6).

In this example, segregation is indicated by the ‘Isolation Index’ (P* index), which measures the degree of exposure of ethnic group x to ethnic group y. The index value represents the probability for a member of ethnic group x, that he or she will have a neighbour from ethnic group y. Positive values indicate a tendency for ethnic group x to concentrate in areas where the percentage of the population from ethnic group y is relatively high, and negative values indicate a negative association between the spatial distribution of the two ethnic groups (Owen & Johnson, 1996). The results of the P* index calculations are presented in table 2.6.
Table 2.6 The Isolation Index, 1991, by local authority districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local authority district</th>
<th>Isolation Index</th>
<th>All black minorities versus white</th>
<th>Black Caribbean versus white</th>
<th>Indian versus white</th>
<th>Pakistani versus white</th>
<th>Bangladeshi versus white</th>
<th>Chinese versus white</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>-31.8</td>
<td>-21.0</td>
<td>-30.8</td>
<td>-44.2</td>
<td>-46.9</td>
<td>-10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolverhampton</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>-20.5</td>
<td>-12.3</td>
<td>-24.4</td>
<td>-32.0</td>
<td>-12.3</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwell</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-24.5</td>
<td>-17.0</td>
<td>-26.0</td>
<td>-33.2</td>
<td>-39.0</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-19.5</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
<td>-19.7</td>
<td>-38.1</td>
<td>-38.0</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsall</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-25.0</td>
<td>-12.9</td>
<td>-22.9</td>
<td>-35.3</td>
<td>-45.3</td>
<td>-7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1991 Census Local Base Statistics (Owen and Johnson, 1996)

Whites are most isolated from other ethnic groups in those districts where the minority ethnic group share of the population is greatest, and the degree of isolation declines as the minority share of the population declines. The number -31.8 indicates that the chance of a person from a minority ethnic group in Birmingham to have a white neighbour is about 32 percent less than would be implied by the population structure of the city.

Of all the minority ethnic groups, the Bangladeshi population is most isolated from the white population in the city of Birmingham, followed by the Pakistani population. Also in the other districts, both groups have the highest isolation indices, with the exception of the Bangladeshi population in Wolverhampton, which seems more likely to come into contact with the white population. The degree of isolation from the white population is the lowest for the Chinese population in every district. None of the minority ethnic groups show a tendency to concentrate in an area where there is a large representation of the white population.

Table 2.7 represents the development of geographical segregation of different black and ethnic minority groups, in the five West Midlands districts between 1981 and 1991, calculated at the ED-scale. In 1981, even more so than in 1991, the degree of segregation was greater in the district with a large foreign born population. Overall, there has been a decline in the segregation scores for all groups.

Some overall conclusions were drawn for all of the fourteen districts with the largest black and ethnic-minority population. The residential pattern of different minority ethnic groups still shows a considerable degree of geographical concentration, with an orientation towards old and central parts of the larger urban areas (figure 2.9). Members of some ethnic groups (notably Chinese, Indian and Black African) are also represented in more wealthy areas. Pakistanis and Bangladeshis show the highest degrees of concentration and generally have the worst housing. The degree of geographical segregation between whites and ethnic minorities is still substantial, but it appears to have declined over the decade 1981-1991 (Owen & Johnson, 1996).
Table 2.7 Changing patterns of geographical segregation, by country of birth 1981-1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local authority district</th>
<th>East Africa</th>
<th>Caribbean</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>South East Asia</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>-20.0</td>
<td>-12.5</td>
<td>-13.5</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
<td>-20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolverhampton</td>
<td>-14.7</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
<td>-17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwell</td>
<td>-13.1</td>
<td>-9.1</td>
<td>-10.3</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
<td>-17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>-11.7</td>
<td>-8.3</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>-14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsall</td>
<td>-20.1</td>
<td>-9.8</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
<td>-17.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2.4 Indices of deprivation

In their study "Poverty, Housing Tenure and Social Exclusion" (1997), Lee and Murie argue for the use of a composite measure to target areas of deprivation, instead of using a single indicator. In the latter case, for instance when the analysis is restricted to the income-variable, the outcomes indicate the economic dimension of exclusion exclusively, whereas the other (political, social) dimensions of deprivation are not taken into consideration. The use of a composite measure of deprivation—an index—is therefore considered to be more valuable.

2.4.1 The adapted Breadline Britain Index

Lee and Murie examined ten different indices of deprivation which were used at different times and for different purposes. From these ten they have chosen to adapt the Breadline index, which in their analysis emerged as the "the most robust in terms of selection of variables, weighting, standardisation and other dimensions and the strongest basis for measuring and mapping deprivation nationally when using the concept of relative poverty". Since their study concentrates on the relationship between deprivation and housing tenure, the tenure variables were taken out of the index. New weights were calculated for the district- the ward and the enumeration district levels for the whole of Great Britain. For the purpose of their study—the examination of the relationship between deprivation and housing tenure—an analyses at the lowest (enumeration) level is especially important, since the use of data at this

---

5 A detailed description of the construction of this index and the comparison between this index and other alternative indices is available in Gordon, D. and Pantazis, C (Eds) (1995), Breadline Britain in the 1990's, report to the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York.
The smallest spatial scale allows to detect smaller pockets of deprivation within neighbourhoods. An amalgamation of the most disadvantaged 20 percent of enumeration districts in Birmingham has generated seven distinct contiguous geographical areas, which are presented in figure 2.10. These “Neighbourhoods of Disadvantage” contain approximately 20 percent of the total household population of the city. Large concentrations of disadvantaged enumeration districts are mainly situated around the centre of the city. However, it would be an error to say that the inner city is one continuous area of deprivation, and that all poor neighbourhoods are situated within the boundaries of the city centre. There is a small variation in the centre, and some areas of deprivation are also located in the suburbs. These are mainly small pockets of council housing built in the 1960s and the 1970s (Lee and Murie, 1997).

Figure 2.10 The most deprived quintile of areas in Birmingham (1991)

Source: 1991 Census data
Disadvantage, tenure structure, and ethnic make-up

The seven areas (Birmingham West, North Central, South Central, East Central Birmingham, South East Birmingham, North Birmingham Suburb and South Birmingham Suburb) have been analysed further by looking at their tenure structure (table 2.8) and ethnic make-up of the population.

The majority (53 percent) of households in the most disadvantaged neighbourhoods live in council estates in Birmingham. Thus, it would be an error to equate social deprivation with deprivation of council estates. Housing Associations also have an important role throughout the inner city and home ownership even forms the largest tenure in two inner-city neighbourhoods. The peripheral council estates do not have such high levels of deprivation as areas in the middle and inner ring with low levels of council estates (Lee and Murie, 1997).

Similarly, the different areas of deprivation in Birmingham have different characteristics in terms of their population structure and presence of minority ethnic groups (table 2.9). The two disadvantaged suburbs are predominantly white but in four of the other five neighbourhoods white households formed a minority. In East Central and South East Birmingham the Pakistani community predominates. In Birmingham West the predominant households are Indian and Black Caribbean and in South Central they are Black Caribbean. In North Central Birmingham there is a significant representation of each of the minority ethnic groups.

Table 2.8 Disadvantaged neighbourhoods: household tenure (1991)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Own</th>
<th>Private rented</th>
<th>Local authority</th>
<th>Housing associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham West</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Birmingham Suburb</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Birmingham Suburb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total/Average</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: University of Birmingham
Table 2.9 Disadvantaged neighbourhoods: ethnic minority groups (1991).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black Carib.</th>
<th>Black African</th>
<th>P'stani</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>B'deshi</th>
<th>Other Ethnic</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham West</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Birmingham</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Birm. Suburb</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Birm. Suburb</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: University of Birmingham

2.4.2 The Index of Local Conditions
The Department of the Environment (DoE) uses the ‘Index of Local Conditions’ (ILC) as a composite measure of deprivation. This index is calculated for all local authorities in the United Kingdom and allows areas to be ranked against one another. It has been designed to assist in the identification of areas for urban policy attention, and is therefore important to be mentioned here. The index - available at local authority district, electoral ward and enumeration district - uses several different socio-economic indicators:

- On all levels: unemployment, children in low earning households, overcrowded housing, housing lacking basic amenities, households with no car, children in ‘unsuitable’ accommodation.
- On the district- and ward levels: educational participation
- On district level: ratio of long-term to all unemployed, income support recipients, low educational attainment, standardised mortality rates (health), derelict land, house contents insurance premiums (crime proxy).

As was mentioned before the factor ‘ethnicity’ is not taken into consideration with the calculation of this index. The 0-score indicates the average English score for the level of deprivation. Positive index-scores indicate a high deprivation, whereas negative index scores indicate low deprivation. Apart from the rank order list of index-scores, pointing out the rank order in terms of the districts’ level of deprivation, two other scores are given by the DoE, which indicate:

- The ‘extent’: The percentage of enumeration districts, within the district that belong to the most deprived seven percent in the United Kingdom.
- The ‘intensity’: The severity of deprivation in the worst part, i.e. the average score of the three worst wards.
Table 2.10 Local Authority district values and rank positions on degree, extent and intensity (1996), Birmingham urban region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LA name</th>
<th>Value &amp; Reg./nat. rank position (degree)</th>
<th>Value &amp; Reg./nat. rank position (extent)</th>
<th>Value &amp; Reg./nat. rank position (intensity)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>36.47 1/5</td>
<td>19.5 1/19</td>
<td>18.66 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwell</td>
<td>34.30 2/9</td>
<td>11.3 2/31</td>
<td>14.12 2/34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsall</td>
<td>19.42 4/43</td>
<td>6.6 5/59</td>
<td>11.43 6/64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>19.07 5/45</td>
<td>10.5 3/33</td>
<td>13.07 4/43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley</td>
<td>-10.39 11/142</td>
<td>3.3 8/103</td>
<td>9.15 7/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solihull</td>
<td>-19.26 22/223</td>
<td>6.3 6/60</td>
<td>12.43 5/50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DoE

On all three scores Birmingham is ranked highest (table 2.10). The next ‘most deprived’ district in the region is Sandwell, followed by Wolverhampton. The national rank orders in both the degree, the extent and the intensity illuminate Birmingham’s fragile position in relation to the surrounding districts. Even though the degree of Sandwell’s deprivation is still relatively high in the national context, this district has a much lower rank order when the ‘extent’ and the ‘intensity’ are concerned. The average score of Birmingham’s three worst wards is the second highest in the UK.

Figure 2.11 shows the average ward scores for Birmingham’s wards. The wards with the highest index-scores are located in the central part of the city. Comparing figure 2.11 with the distribution of the non-white population (figure 2.9, p. 19), there is a large overlap between the wards with high index scores and the wards with large black and ethnic minority concentrations. This in spite of the omission of ‘ethnicity’ as a deprivation indicator in the calculation of the ILC. Only the ward of Sandwell, where more than half of the population is of black or ethnic minority background has a below the urban average index-score of 1.12.

The North and South Birmingham suburbs—two of the seven areas of disadvantage in the analysis based on the adapted Breadline index—do not reach very high index scores in the calculations used by the Department of the Environment.
2.5 Conclusions

By using some of the different indicators and indices that were available in the UK, the presentation of socio-economic and ethnic segregation has expanded to include—in addition to economic factors—political, health, and educational dimensions. When comparing the different illustrations for the city of Birmingham, the conclusion one sees is that the problematic neighbourhoods, independent of the indicators applied, are mainly concentrated around the centre of the city. There are, however, areas of affluence within the city centre visible on the smallest spatial scale of the enumeration district. Likewise, there are smaller pockets of deprivation in the suburban area surrounding the city. In contrary to the more centrally located neighbourhoods, the latter have a lower share of people of ethnic minorities. Another important finding is that poverty is also found in the owner-occupancy sector. In two of the inner city poverty areas home ownership is the dominant
tenure. For this reason it would be wrong to target regeneration policy solely at council housing estates which will be of disadvantage to many poor (ethnic minority) households who are home-owners.

Within the region, ethnic segregation and deprivation are not exclusive phenomena for the city of Birmingham. The smaller districts also have large immigrant concentrations and areas with a low weekly mean income level and a high proportion of unemployed people. These areas show a great overlap. Thus, the regional pattern of deprivation is not centralised, but there are several poverty 'nodes', which are the centres of the larger towns and cities, particularly in the centre (Birmingham) and in the north-western part of the region, in the districts Wolverhampton, Walsall and Sandwell. Most of the 'better-off' areas are located in the southern, notably the south-eastern section of the region (with the exception of Coventry) and in the most northern part of Birmingham.

The Index of Local Conditions indicates that Birmingham suffers higher levels of disadvantage than the other districts in the region, both in terms of the degree, the extent and the intensity. The intensity in particular, as measured by the average score of the three worst wards, points to the very weak position of Birmingham in the UK. This coincides with the general perspective that most of the districts of the West Midlands area have a high level of disadvantage.

Because of the lack of income-data, the developments over a longer period of time could be illustrated only by the unemployment indicator. Unemployment is declining for the entire city of Birmingham. This positive development, which has set in only recently, does not imply that ward differences are declining. In fact, the rate of unemployment in the worst ward has declined less than average the entire city.

Other districts in the region also experienced declining unemployment over the past years. This has not led to a decreasing spatial polarisation. The rate of unemployment in the districts with the highest unemployment --Birmingham, Wolverhampton, and Sandwell-- has decreased less than average the entire region.

The development of ethnic segregation could only be examined by using 'country of birth', which was available in both the 1981 and the 1991 census. Segregation scores are relatively high, but appear to have declined between 1981 and 1991. The Bangladeshi and the Pakistani populations are most segregated of all ethnic minority groups.
3

THE DEVELOPMENT OF RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION AND DEPRIVATION IN BIRMINGHAM

3.1 Introduction

Several factors have contributed to the increasing socio-economic and ethnic (spatial) polarisation of the population in the urban region of Birmingham: the suburbanisation of affluent households, the influx of a large and diverse immigrant population into the urban centre, the decline of the manufacturing industry without sufficient job compensation offered by the growing service industry, and a lessening of state support. None of these factors are unique for the case of Birmingham, but can be applied to a majority of cities in the western industrialised world. Yet, in spite of the similarities, the spatial outcomes of these trends do not lead to similar patterns of deprivation. The different spatial distributions of poverty, and the different intensity and speed in which polarisation processes occur depend not only on the economic and political climate of the area, but are largely related to local historical circumstances.

In this chapter we will concentrate on how all of these modifying forces have influenced segregation in the specific case of Birmingham and its region.

3.2 A brief and recent historical context

A metaphor regularly used for the city of Birmingham is that of ‘a concrete jungle’. This reputation is associated with the road network and city centre development which took place after the World War II. Birmingham’s centre became a place where pedestrians were dominated by cars.

Over the past decades many efforts have been taken to redress the earlier mistakes. An important factor in enhancing the city centre’s image is the improvement of the pedestrian and built environment. For many people these attempts seem to have been successful, since the core has increasingly become a luring place for leisure and shopping. The construction of, among others, a Symphony Hall, an International Convention Centre, large shopping centres, and several theatres and museums have favoured this development. Another aspect which was considered important to improve the core’s vitality is the improvement of the existing housing stock.
Generally this has led to new residential developments, often adjacent to waterways, and integrated with commercial and leisure developments. Their primary purpose is to attract new investment and residents. The majority of the central city population still lives in accommodations which are rented from the Local Authority (71.4% in 1991). This share was almost 17 percent points higher in 1981 (87.9%). The efforts to revitalise the city have led to a growing share of owner occupied housing from 2 percent in 1981 to 10.3 percent in 1991 (The Birmingham Plan 1993). This conversion did not yet lead to a large scale expulsion of low-income households from the city-centre. However, a continuation of the processes may trigger a similar movement.

3.3 Demographic changes since the 1950s

The city of Birmingham has lost population to other areas in the region for many decades and its population has been in absolute decline since the 1950s. However, the number of dwellings within the city has continued to rise, driven by the trend towards increasing numbers of small households. There is a large concern about the selective out-migration by higher socio-economic groups which is expected to continue and which leads to increased social polarisation between the city and the surrounding communities. This polarisation has also been fuelled by the settlement of a large immigrant population, attracted to jobs in the manufacturing industry, in and near the urban core.

Presently, the West Midlands, after London, has the highest concentration of ethnic minority residents in Great Britain today. However, the influx of a large immigrant population into the region is not unique to the city of Birmingham. Other cities in the Midlands have also attracted a large ‘foreign’ population as we have seen in the previous chapter.

Because of economic constraints, discrimination on the housing market, and processes of self-segregation the immigrant populations have come to live in geographically confined areas, mainly around the city-centres. Generally, they moved into the neighbourhoods and houses that were in poor condition and undesired by white middle-class households.

The continuing trend towards the suburbanisation of population, from (the inner urban area of) Birmingham to smaller towns and more rural communities, resulted in people of ethnic minority groups becoming increasingly concentrated in the central city-areas. With the restructuring of the economy since World War II, the demand for labour in the traditional industries has declined. New types of jobs and places of employment have developed in locations well away from the areas where most immigrants live (Radciffe, 1996).

Since the residential pattern of immigrants in Birmingham has been very stable over the past decade this situation is of great concern.
3.4 Economic restructuring and globalisation

The Birmingham urban region experienced high rates of economic growth from the Industrial Revolution until the early 1970s. This was mainly driven by the expansion of the engineering and car industries. Just after the war, Birmingham’s economy was at its peak, and Birmingham goods were well known brand names around the world.

In the 1970s the local economy went into structural decline. This was both the result of internal causes, such as a lack of investment and too little innovation, and the external cause of a strong foreign competition. UK manufacturing investment per employee has been consistently lower than in other developed competitor countries such as France, Germany, the US and Japan. The decline in the manufacturing industry did not affect white, black, and other ethnic minority communities in similar ways. When many of the immigrants first settled in Birmingham, they worked in jobs for unskilled and semi-skilled workers, then still widely available. As a result, people from black and other ethnic minority communities suffered a disproportionate level of unemployment from the job loss in the manufacturing industry.

Birmingham’s main strategy to improve its economy was diversification. In spite of this strategy the West Midlands region remains one of the most manufacturing dependent in the UK. Latest estimates are that 23.6 percent of employment and 30 percent of its GDP is directly attributable to manufacturing, compared with 16 percent of employment and 22 percent of GDP in the rest of the UK (West Midlands labour market and skill trends 1996-1997). Moreover, many of the city’s service activities such as transport, hotels and financial and other business services are dependent upon local manufacturing for their existence.

A growth in the manufacturing output has been predicted, based on the projected expansion of the motor vehicle industry. Yet, the increase in the overall number of job opportunities is unlikely to be able to recompense for the sustained loss of jobs in this sector over the past thirty years. New jobs that are created increasingly demand workers with higher educational qualifications and skills. This has considerable implications for black, other ethnic minority and white working class workers as well.

3.5 The organisation of the state and city

In the typology of welfare state regimes by Esping-Andersen (1990), Britain is grouped in a liberal welfare state category. According to Murie (1996), two important elements --health provision and housing benefits-- are excluded from the identification of social security arrangements on which the categorisation is based. In the British context, these two elements are particularly important: "a National Health Service, free at the point of consumption, and low rents associated with rent control and subsidy have been critical influences on benefit rates" (Murie, unpublished). In these two aspects Britain has been fundamentally different from truly ‘liberal welfare
states’ such as the USA and Canada. Another flaw in the typology is the exclusion of the taxation system, which in most countries predates systems of social security. For instance tax relief for private insurance represent state sponsorship and reduces real market costs. According to a memorandum on “Social Justice Strategy” by the policy division of the Birmingham City Council, recent policies in taxation have brought about increased income inequalities. The significant increases in indirect taxes such as VAT (Value Added Tax) and the introduction of VAT on fuel, disproportionately affect those on low incomes. At the same time, changes in direct tax have reduced the tax burden for those with incomes well above the average.

A further remark on Esping-Andersen’s typology is that welfare regimes generally do not fit into one specific category, nor are they static. In Britain, the economic and fiscal crisis of the 1970s occurred when the welfare state was already under strain. Consequently, the government was forced to cut back welfare expenditures. In general, universal benefits have given way to more selective ‘means tested’ benefits (Murie, 1994). In addition, the value of benefits to earnings eroded when the government ended the link between the main social security benefits and the movement of earnings in the 1980s. This has resulted in a widening income gap between those on benefits and the population with earnings.

The cut back on welfare expenditures has several consequences for British housing policy. The restructuring of housing in Britain has involved a number of specific elements:

- The restructuring in the public sector to replace object subsidies with means tested housing allowances and move towards market level rents with means tested housing benefits as the mechanism to assist those unable to afford these rents.
- The continued availability and even growth of fiscal and occupational welfare in housing; the system is characterised by low taxation and benefits enabling house purchase.
- The reduction in new building and investment in the public sector combined with the sale of public sector housing to reduce the size of the social rented sector.
- Other elements of privatisation in relation to public sector housing.
- Shortages and problems of access to council housing creating new problems of homelessness and exclusion (Murie, 1994).

As a result of housing benefit changes, more people have been caught in a poverty situation. The financial incentives to purchase a house have led to a decline of the low rent private housing stock, which for a long time acted as a buffer modifying an extreme polarisation between social rented housing and home ownership.

---

6 16 and 17 year olds have been excluded from Income support since 1988. Job Seekers Allowance, brings in reduced contributory benefits for 18-24 year olds, and the tests for ‘availability for work’ and ‘actively seeking work’ have become tougher.

7 Occupational welfare refers to private provision through the employer or associated with employment as against either state provision or privately purchased provision with no reference to the employer.
Consequently, the social rented sector has increasingly served the role of sole provider of alternatives to home ownership and housing for those on low incomes and not in work. The position of many tenants in housing association dwellings has especially become precarious. Because of relative high rent-levels in this sector, there is a large household-dependency on means tested housing benefits. However, tenants risk losing their benefits once their income increases. Thus, only high paid jobs make working financially worthwhile, in effect trapping those people with low job qualifications. Another notice that should be made in regard to the promotion of home-ownership is the effect this policy has had on the characteristics of the owner-occupancy sector itself. Many people who decided to buy their house through the interference of the ‘right to buy’ program, bought a piece of property of relatively low value. Many people could not afford the large investments that were needed to improve or keep up the quality of their home. Consequently, the often presumed relation between owner-occupancy and attractive, well maintained housing has faded.

3.6 In brief

The trends which have been described in this chapter have led to an increasing socio-economic polarisation of Birmingham's population. Lacking sufficient skills and qualifications to participate in the growth sectors of the economy, people of black ethnic minority background have experienced a disproportionate decline in their socio-economic position. In addition the spatial mismatch between job demand and supply, affects the population of black-ethnic minority background in particular. Because of the changing welfare regime the black and ethnic minority population, and poor people generally, receives less support from the state government, trapping them in a poverty situation. Since a majority of immigrants reside in the central city area, the ethnic and economic character of many urban neighbourhoods is in sharp contrast with the more affluent suburban areas. This holds true for all of the districts in the larger urban region, where similar patterns are noticeable.

The majority of poor households, including low-income white households, is concentrated in the social rented sector of the housing market. Until 1980 this concentration increased, due to the decline of the privately rented sector and a greater reliance on the social rented sector for those unable to buy a house. However, since the 1980s the size and quality of this sector has declined, and within it there is increasing social polarisation. Some indicators thereof are the growing number of people who are unemployed and a decline in the share of well to do households in council housing estates. As a result of the right to buy policy, poverty has also dispersed itself amongst the owner-occupancy section.

In short, deprivation is not restricted to areas with a large proportion of social housing and the evidence suggests that the private rented sector and lower-income home ownership is often associated with poverty. This is especially true among the ethnic minority population. The concentrations of deprivation around the inner city spreads wider than the council housing estates and includes the older Victorian areas of terraced housing which are privately owned.
4 NATIONAL AND LOCAL POLICY

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter we will focus on the answers of national, regional and local policy makers to the issue of residential ethnic and socio-economic segregation. A distinction can be made between policy measures which explicitly aim at the dispersal of people, and policies that compensate for the (perceived) negative consequences of living in a poverty neighbourhood. The policy measures that can be seen in the light of immigrant policy will be dealt with separately in section 4.3. Before discussing policy aspects it seems useful to first explain the institutional context of the UK. The next paragraph will therefore describe how different political responsibilities and competencies are divided between national, regional and local administrations.

4.2 The institutional context

The UK has no written constitution. Neither the division of responsibilities and competencies between the central and lower authorities nor the provision of funds has been formally laid down. Parliament has the authority to make amendments without consulting local expertise or people involved (Van den Berg et al., 1994). In 1974, a reorganisation of the internal administration was undertaken, which led to a fierce reduction in the number of counties and districts. For six metropolitan regions metropolitan county councils (MCCs) were installed. The urban region around the city of Birmingham came under the ‘West Midlands County Council’ (WMCC), which had mostly planning tasks. The MCC had authority in the areas of public order, safety and waste disposal. The WMCC had some fundamental shortcomings such as the lack of strategic leadership, too little power to impose decisions and no integral approach to regional policy. A successful regional development strategy has never been developed by this body and therefore the abolishment of the MCCs by the Thatcher administration in 1986 did not have a large impact on regional decision making, contrary to the example of London.

In urban regions there are now two government tiers: the state and the district local
government. The districts fulfil local functions such as the maintenance of local roads, housing, and town rehabilitation. Districts are composed of several 'wards'. Wards represent the constituency of a district councillor and are electoral units. The councillors serve a political function for the whole city and have no specific power or role in relation to the ward that elected them.

Some of the tasks that used to be carried out by the MCC have been transferred to independent organisations, such as Joint Boards: partnerships installed by the State. Other responsibilities have been handed over to the districts. The organisation and implementation of some tasks calls for a supra-district level. To that end the districts in former MCC areas have created inter-administrative 'Joint Committees' which operate in certain policy areas. The Department of the Environment (DoE) acts as supervisor of these committees. Together with the Joint Committees this Ministry sees to it that the various policy areas are congruent.

The seven districts of the West Midlands have been rather successful in their partnership. This could be ascribed to the region's tradition of consultation among districts even before the founding of the WMCC. Another reason may be the strong need for regional collaboration, to avoid a situation in which the central authorities impose things on the region (Van den Berg et al., 1994). The tradition of consultation among the seven West Midlands districts is also noticeable in the field of planning. Since the abolishment of the WMCC, every district had its own development strategy, consisting of so-called 'unitary development plans'. In addition, the West Midlands was the first region to have operational strategic guidance, which is an instrument of the national government for the co-ordination of local policy among districts. In the West Midlands the strategic guidance was initiated by the region itself. It deals with six themes: urban regeneration, housing, economy and employment, transport, green belt, and shopping. However, the partnership has been successful only when local interests are not planning conflicting policies. In contentious policy areas, collaboration is not practised. As a result, a competition between the districts still takes place in such instances as housing and the programming of office locations. This indicates a great weakness: the inability of the partnership to make decisions without consensus among the districts, and the lack of authority to impose decisions on the districts.

In 1994, the national government established ten Government Offices for the Region (GoRs) in which the staffs of four different government offices are integrated. The four government offices involved were already existing offices in the West Midlands, they were just not linked. The West Midlands Regional Office is responsible for the preparation of 'Regional Planning Guidance' and administering regional assistance and European Structural Funds. Another important responsibility is the management of the Single Regeneration Budget (SRB), which will be described in paragraph 4.4. In carrying out their tasks, the GoRs are centrally accountable to strict national guidelines.

---

8 Employment (ED), Environment (DoE), Transport (DoT) and Trade and Industry (DTI).
The abolition of the MCC, and the installation of the GoRs, supervised by the central government, indicate an increasing centralism. In this regard the UK is an exception to most other European countries, such as France and the Netherlands, where the reverse trend of decentralisation is occurring. Several other developments underline this development. For instance, the share of local taxes of the municipal budgets has declined to 14 percent. Today, just over 85 percent of the local budget is funded by the national government through general and specific payments (Breebaart et al., 1996). In addition, the national government has the right to install a maximum spending threshold, a regulation known as 'rate capping'. Furthermore, the position of the local government has been eroded by the privatisation of services that were traditionally performed by local authorities, such as (public) transport and water provision.

Another example of increasing central authority is the Urban Development Corporation (UDC), one of which is in Birmingham\(^9\). The UDCs operate within the territory of the local communities but are financed by and directly subordinate to the national government. Within their areas they are the prime development control authorities, meaning that they do not have to consider local planning practices. Another possibility to withdraw from local control is the practice of 'opting out'. Schools, for example, can escape from the control of a Local Education Authority by submitting a request for nationally allocated subsidies. In the field of housing policy a similar situation exists: the national government makes money available to enable housing authorities to transfer poor quality housing to new landlords. The influence of the local government on the housing market has also declined as a result of the right to buy program. About one million people used this opportunity in the 1980s (Breebaart et al., 1996).

The outcomes of the national elections of April 1997 mark an important shift in the political climate of the UK. For the first time since 1979, the Tories had to give way to the Labour party. It remains to be seen what the consequences of this turnover will be for the division of responsibilities and competencies.

4.3 Immigrant policy in the UK and in Birmingham

An important aspect of immigrant policy in the UK is Section 11 of the Local Government Act of 1966. This has been the only central Government funding available to meet the specific needs of ethnic minorities. Under Section 11 the central government pays grants to local authorities to meet the costs of employing additional staff required to enable members of ethnic minority groups to overcome linguistic or cultural barriers. Education --in particular English as a Second Language courses to language-minority children-- is the main beneficiary. But section 11 funding is also used to support work in training and enterprise activities. There has been a long debate on the necessity and the effectiveness of the Section 11

\(^9\) The Birmingham Heartlands UDC.
funds. An outcome of the Home Office review of Section 11 is that this funding will eventually be phased out as ethnic minority needs are incorporated into more general programmes to fight deprivation. In the year 1995/1996 Birmingham still received £3,367,801, of which only 1.3 percent was meant for new projects. At present, the Section 11 fund has been integrated with the Single Regeneration Budget (SRB). This development is characteristic for immigrant policy in almost all Western countries, where a trend from specific programmes aimed at ethnic minorities to a universal approach is noticeable (Musterd et al., 1998).

An important organisation in the field of immigrant policy, is the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE). This quasi-autonomous non-governmental organisation (quango), is responsible for formulating policy advise with regard to equal opportunities and the fighting of racism. The CRE observes the enactment of the Race Relations Act of 1977. Most cities with a large immigrant population have local advisory boards, the Racial Equality Councils. These Councils receive money from the CRE and also the local authorities.

Despite the UK's centralised power structure, municipalities are more or less free to decide how they want to accommodate people of foreign backgrounds. Consequently there are large differences between municipal policies. In Birmingham these interests have been promoted in several ways. In 1986 the Birmingham City Council committed itself to recruiting 20 percent of its workforce from black and other ethnic minority communities. One factor which contributed to the emergence of this policy was the CRE's 'Code of practice in recruitment and employment' which had set this recruitment target. The City Council applied this rule for major building projects such as the construction of the Convention Centre. Construction companies that were contracted were obliged to recruit 20 percent black and ethnic minorities. The city council itself has been able to meet the 20 percent recruitment target. Though, according to a former executive of the Race Relations Unit at the Birmingham City Council, most members of black and other ethnic minority groups at the City Council work in the lower levels of the organisation.

The City Council has committed itself to the fighting of racism and racial discrimination by adopting a 'Race Equality Strategy'. This describes the aims and objectives for achieving race equality in the services it provides in housing, education, and social and leisure services. Once again the introduction of this strategy has been triggered by an initiative of the CRE: the 'Standards in Local Government' is a set of criteria used to assess the performance of Local Authorities on race equality issues.

A third aspect of local immigrant policy is the provision of funds to voluntary organisations providing services and support to ethnic minority groups. Because of increasing community involvement in decision making processes, these voluntary organisations are becoming more and more influential, especially in urban regeneration efforts.
The practice of racial dispersion, applied by the local authority between 1969 and 1975 (Flett et al., in Breebaart et al., 1996) was abolished because it conflicted with the statutes of the Race Relations Act of 1977.

4.4 National and local policy aimed at the undivided city

4.4.1 National policy: the Single Regeneration Budget
Despite its existence, segregation has not been recognised as an issue by policy makers in Great Britain. Segregation is considered to be the consequence of the market position of certain groups of people, and is not dealt with as a factor that may influence this position. Consequently, no national policies are explicitly used to deal with the issue of residential segregation. However, this does not mean that policy makers are not concerned with the growing disparities amongst the population. Social polarisation, social exclusion and deprivation have become topics of increasing debate. The term ‘underclass’, previously limited to the United States, has also come into use in the UK (Lee 1994).

The English ‘equivalent’ to the Dutch Policy of the Large Cities is the Single Regeneration Budget (SRB), in effect since April, 1994. The Government Offices for the Region (GoRs) are responsible for the implementation of this policy. The SRB is an attempt to achieve a comprehensive and bottom up approach to the regeneration of deprived areas. It draws together existing budgets from 20 central government programmes in the field of housing, training, and education, which were previously operated by four different government departments. Among other activities, the SRB incorporates a ‘Challenge Fund’ to encourage local communities to come up with comprehensive packages to improve the quality of life in their areas. The SRB Challenge Fund means there is competition between authorities to obtain funding and they are not guaranteed that they will succeed. Also, Training and Enterprise Councils (TECs) can make a funding bid. The bids need to pay attention to several issues such as the encouragement of local economic development, the training of local people, the improvement of the infrastructure and the housing stock (with emphasis on “greater choice and diversity”), the tackling of crime, and the promotion of initiatives of benefit to ethnic minorities. In addition, the bids have to lever in the private sector and other resources, including European funding. Finally, they have to involve tenant and community participation. The severity of deprivation is no longer a prime selection criteria for the bids. More important is the expected output in terms of the number of jobs created, the number


11 Employment (ED) Environment (DoE) Transport (DoT) and Trade and Industry (DTI).
of people trained, or housing quality improvements. The assessment of the bids also includes an analysis of the relationship between deprivation, as measured by the DoE's Index of Local Conditions (ILC), and the allocation of the resources. However, the evaluations of the winning bids have pointed out that this relationship is weak. The districts with a high index-score indicating a high level of deprivation, do not necessarily receive most SRB Challenge Funding. In the rural areas of the West Midlands for instance there was an extensive targeting of resources to districts with moderate scores on the ILC. Districts with high or medium scores on the ILC and low allocations from the SRB Challenge Fund were predominantly located in the urban areas (review of challenge fund round II).

**Financing and allocation priorities**

Expenditures on programmes now within the SRB peaked in 1992/1993 at £1.695 billion and by 1994/1995 were subject to a 15 percent decline. In the subsequent years the budget was further curtailed: between 1993/1994 and 1997/1998 the SRB was subject to a reduction of 25.5 percent (Executive Summary Round I). Due to existing central government expenditure commitments on former programmes (such as City Challenge or the Urban Development Corporations) only £125 million of the total SRB budget was available for new programmes in 1994.

The main programmes subsumed into the SRB in 1994/1995 included Estate Action\(^{12}\) (£373m), Housing Action Trust (£88m), Section 11 programme targeted at ethnic minority needs (£60m), and business development and education expenditure administered by Training and Enterprise Councils (£137m).

The budgets of the programmes that were previously run by the Department of the Environment (DoE urban and DoE housing) constituted the largest share of the SRB budget total (21%). In spite of this, housing did not have a priority in the redistribution of the budget. Financial cuts between 1993/1994 and 1997/1998 reduced funding for DoE programmes in particular. The reduction in funding for DoE programmes is also mirrored by an apparent fall in the relative importance of housing issues within the approved SRB programme. In 1994/1995 the Estate Action Programme accounted for nearly 26 percent of the SRB budget. The £80 million of expenditure on housing refurbishment between 1995/1996 and 1997/1998 accounts for only 14 percent of the available funding in these years.

The proposals that were approved in the first bidding round, and their relation to the objectives of the SRB, indicate a priority for economic and training activities. The majority of the 95 bids contained employment/education proposals, 72 related to economic growth and wealth creation, while housing and ethnic minority issues were highlighted by only 35 bids. Of the successful bidders, 80 percent emphasised job creation, 65 percent emphasised training, and 61 percent business start-ups (Hall, 1996). Only 47 of the 201 successful bids contained outputs which focused on

---

\(^{12}\) Estate Action is a programme aimed to improve run-down local authority estates. Important objectives are the involvement of local residents, the encouragement of private investment, and the diversification of tenure.
addressing the disadvantage of ethnic minority groups (section 11 type projects). A relatively large share of these bids came from local authorities in the West Midlands region. The West Midlands is also one of the three regions (together with the London - and the North West Region) where housing still receives some priority. In general, however, it is clear that both housing and immigrant policy are considered to be of minor importance in the regeneration of urban areas and these programme aspects find it difficult to survive under the SRB.

The review report of the second bidding round (1995/1996) indicates that programmes supporting housing and ethnic minorities have even become more vulnerable. Compared to most other regions, the West Midlands Region is nonetheless very active in both policy aspects, particularly Ethnic Minority policy. Comparing the first and the second round of bidding in the West Midlands region, the housing outputs show a decrease by 36 percent. This decrease has especially been noticeable in the refurbishment of council housing (Hall and Mason, 1996).

4.4.2 Local implementations: Birmingham in the West Midlands

City Challenge

Because of the shift away from urban priority areas, cities such as Birmingham receive less funding under the SRB. One of the DoE programmes, incorporated in the SRB, which still targets cities is ‘City Challenge’. There are three City Challenge projects in the urban region of Birmingham: Wolverhampton City Challenge, Walsall City Challenge and Newton South Aston City Challenge in Birmingham. They are very similar to the SRB Challenge Fund, except that they are urban based and the level of deprivation is a more important criterion in the allocation of resources. The programmes started in 1992 and 1993 and will be terminated in March 1997 or March 1998.

Heartlands Development Corporation

Another programme operating in Birmingham is the ‘Heartlands Urban Development Corporation, (UDC). Until 1992 the Heartlands UDC was still a Urban Development Agency (UDA).

The history and strategy of this agency—in which the City Council and the private sector co-operate in tackling urban problems—is often viewed as a successful example of regeneration because of the benefits it brought to the residents of the area (Wood, 1994).

The Heartlands initiative lies to the east and north of the city centre. The area, which is home to a population of approximately 13,000 people, used to be notorious for its bad economic, social, and environmental climate. Unemployment was high, most of the housing—a majority of which is local authority housing—was rundown, and the area had higher mortality rates than other parts of the city.

The Heartlands DA was established in 1988 to bring relief to this area without loosing local democratic control. Numerous strategies were set out by the agency, including new business and industrial development, industrial improvement, infrastructural improvements, and large retail and service developments. Another
important area of focus was housing improvement and development. The goal was to increase the stock of dwellings and to widen the choice of tenure. The initial strategy-purpose was to introduce “households with different patterns of expenditure as well as to improve the conditions for existing tenants” (Wood, 1994). The overall goal of the strategy was the creation of a very high-quality environment to attract new private investment and new residents.

The key residential development is Bordesley Urban Village. In this area of approximately 40 hectares, the existing local authority housing was to be retained and improved, and new housing development—mainly home-ownership and some social rented accommodation—was to be provided by private investors and housing associations. The property for sale was meant to be affordable to low- and middle-income families. The housing development strategy is clearly an example of what would be called ‘housing market restructuring’ in the Netherlands. However, the connection between a mixed population and the prevention of ‘ghettoisation’is not explicit.

Local residents have expressed concern about how the development and improvement plans would affect the local population, the fear being the creation of a ‘yuppie’-area, in which settled residents could no longer afford to live. The fear of this scenario has evaporated over the years. An unpublished survey by Birmingham Heartlands Ltd, indicated that 80 percent of the new occupants of the 118 houses completed in Bordesley Village until 1992 has come from within a three-miles radius (Wood, 1994). In addition, the development plans have included a community centre, a village centre, shops, and health facilities.

In the most rundown areas of the Heartlands—Nechells and Bloomsbury—major housing improvements have been made, including measures to provide affordable housing for sale and rent to local residents. The large local authority housing estates have been refurbished through Estate Action funding. At the Bloomsbury estate a management board has been installed to involve the local residents in managing the affairs of the estate. Finally, considerable attention has also been paid to social, educational and employment initiatives, including the formation of an ‘Education Compact’ between the local authority and local industrialists geared towards securing jobs for school leavers in Heartlands.

With the establishment of a Heartlands UDC in 1992—triggered by financial constraints of the UDA—the question arose whether the new organisational arrangements and five years of funding by the national government would not help to promote development initiatives at the expense of the needs of the wider community. However, since the parties involved in managing the area remained mostly the same, no direct changes in the philosophy and approach were expected. An important question left open is how successful the Heartlands UDC has been in satisfying the needs of the local population, and whether it has created a wider income-mix in the formerly deprived area. Another question concerns the future of the Heartlands after the termination of the five-year UDC funding period. Will the area become economically self-sufficient or should public funding become more structural?
A third important programme, now part of the wider SRB, is ‘Housing Action Trusts’ (HATs). A HAT is a non-departmental body, charged with the task of regenerating severely run-down council housing estates when the scale of the problems have proved to be beyond the capacity of local authorities. Each HAT is run by a board whose members live in or have a special knowledge of the HAT’s area. Tenants however have a major role in the development of the HAT. In the whole of the U.K. there are only six HATs.

The Castle Vale HAT in Birmingham is an example of the holistic approach presently applied to regenerate deprived urban areas. Castle Vale is an outer city estate in the north east of the city with approximately 12,000 inhabitants. It was built between 1964 and 1969, to rehouse the (mainly white) people of the inner city areas who lost their homes due to large scale housing demolitions in the 1950s and 1960s. Only the last section was built for owner occupation. Still, the area is dominated by council housing for low income households. Over the past decades, the area became notorious for several reasons: poor housing quality, high unemployment, low educational attainment, poor health indicators, high crime levels, and environmental problems.

The Castle Vale HAT was implemented through a collaboration between the local authority and the local communities. The HAT took over a stock of 3,500 (out of 5,000) homes, the shopping centre, and large undeveloped terrains. The strategies which are applied to improve the conditions of the area range from a wide spectrum covering the areas of planning, housing, economic policy, and human services. One of the primary measures is the rebuilding programme. The initial plan replaced half of the 34 high-rise tower blocks and to replace them with low-rise housing built to upper-income standards. When it became clear that the refurbishment of the remaining high rise stock would become too costly, it was decided to demolish all of the dilapidated flats. By building more houses for sale, the HAT is trying to satisfy the housing aspirations of higher-income households within their own neighbourhood. In this example, the long term success of the restructuring efforts depends on the capability of the local population to improve their socio-economic position. Therefore, the HAT has conducted a few studies which concentrated on:

- the identification of unemployment levels, skill levels, and aspirations of the residents;
- the inventory of training provisions;
- the needs and requirements of surrounding business community.

The studies have pointed out the areas of need in the surrounding business community and the skills and aspirations of the local population. By attuning one to the other, a higher level of employment has been achieved. More employment has also been stimulated by setting up private services, such as a bus service and a housing association. The comprehensive approach is completed by the provision of a nursing home and a new health centre. A football stadium is planned in order to stimulate social activities and improve the overall social climate.
Work and housing are equally important recovery strategies in the example of the Castle Vale HAT. The regeneration approach is based on two different ‘pillars’. First, through the creation of job opportunities and the training of the local population, more people are given the opportunity to improve their socio-economic position. Second, by trying to meet the housing aspirations of the economically successful people within the area, it is hoped that the population will become more mixed, thus lifting Castle Vale from its long term depression.

4.5 Planning and housing policy instruments versus segregation

4.5.1 Planning policy
The statutory planning document for Birmingham is the Urban Development Plan (UDP), adopted in July, 1993. The UDP is part of a policy context set by the Secretary of State in the Planning Policy Guidance Note 10 (PPG10). The UDP has two key objectives: first the revitalisation of the city’s economy and second the regeneration of the urban area, in particular the inner urban areas and deprived peripheral estates. For both objectives, housing plays an important role. The UDP’s housing chapter provides a policy framework for improving and protecting the quality of the existing stock, and for the provision of new dwellings. It states that from 1986 to 2001, 49,500 additional dwellings will be required. Almost half of this requirement is to be met within the city. The other half will be provided beyond the city’s boundaries. As well as establishing the amount of housing to be provided, the UDP also seeks to influence the type of dwellings built. It encourages a diversity of housing, in particular on the sites larger than one hectare. In order to meet a range of needs and demands, affordable housing should also be included in development plans. The national government’s “Planning Policy Guidance Note” (PPG3) enables local authorities to negotiate with developers for the provision of affordable housing on proposed private residential developments. Local authorities are required to demonstrate that such affordable dwellings are needed and must have policies which are flexible and not tenure specific. Consequently, affordable housing in this context is not the same as council housing as it can also include affordable private housing. In September 1995 the PPG10 was replaced by a Regional Planning Guidance (RPG11) for the West Midlands, issued by the Secretary of State. The purpose is to provide the policy framework for statutory planning for the West Midlands region up to 2011. The RPG11 states that, between 1991 and 2011, 41,000 dwellings should be provided in Birmingham, an annual rate of 2,050. In reality, the housing need is probably even bigger: the RPG11 is underpinned by 1989 household projections which are estimated too low. A crucial issue, according to a Birmingham Housing Requirement Study, is the extent to which sufficient provision can be made within the city boundary. Since it is unlikely that there will be social housing development proposals in the overspill areas, the dwellings built outside of the city boundary will tend to draw owner-occupiers out of the city. This will reinforce social segregation.
4.5.2 Housing policy aimed at the undivided city

A policy which aims at the creation of a wider mix of housing tenure, has been in place since the early 1980s and has taken different forms since then. The right to buy programme implemented by the Thatcher administration was the first attempt. Under this programme, tenants were given the opportunity to buy their home with large discounts, dependent on the length of their tenure. The general results of this policy have already been mentioned: a marginalisation of occupants in the socially rented stock and the purchase of property of little value. Birmingham is one of the prime examples where council houses were sold by the local authority before the right to buy was introduced. Consequently quite a significant number of properties had already been sold before 1980. Together with the considerable impact of the right to buy, it has reduced the stock of council housing in the middle ring of the city, of inter-war houses with gardens and left the sector more dominated by the 1960s, mass housing, including flatted accommodation and slum clearance redevelopments.

Another attempt to create diversity was made in the housing association sector. Over the past decades the associations have become the most important social landlords, whereas the role of the council sector has been diminished. The housing associations have created different kinds of tenure: rental dwellings with rents higher than the average rent-level in the council houses, shared-ownership, or owner occupancy. Shared-ownership schemes give people the opportunity to buy only a part of their dwelling. In this way it is possible to rent 75 percent of a home and own the remaining 25 percent. Residents can buy a larger share of their home once they can afford it. Supposedly, this has happened only to a small degree, and according to a respondent at the city council, the residents are very often forced to sell their share of the dwelling back to the association. Another way in which housing diversity has been stimulated is the so-called ‘Tenant Incentive Scheme’. Residents of council estates, according to this regulation, can receive a grant to buy a house in the private sector.

Even though tenure diversity has been stimulated for a long time, as is proved by the examples above, these strategies have never been area-based and are therefore not deliberately intended to reduce segregation. They can be seen in the light of general measures to reduce public expenditure on housing. In fact, the only area of substantial expenditure in housing programmes, is the provision to fund the transfer of council estates to new private sector landlords, which reflects the government’s promotion of home-ownership. Over the past two decades this has led to a more even distribution of the population amongst the different tenure-categories. The question can be raised to what extent the housing policy was aimed at an undivided city. According to several respondents there was, in some ways, an explicit attempt to encourage social difference to be expressed in terms of where people lived and what they lived in. In this sense the marginalisation and residualisation of council housing is intentional rather than accidental.

In the example of the Castle Vale HAT, the diversification of the housing stock is meant to enlarge the housing options of the local residents. In the case of the Heartlands UDC this goal is subordinate to the larger goal of promoting the city
centre as an attractive location for permanent and temporary city dwellers: businesses, tourists, and new residents. Because of their strong voice and financial support, the new developments did not lead to a large expulsion of the settled residents.

Generally, the goal of the housing market restructuring policy in Birmingham and in the UK is to give the beneficiaries of economic regeneration and training efforts the possibility to stay in their neighbourhood. In this way the segregation of low income households is hoped to be resolved, at least on a higher spatial level. Whether this argument holds true on a smaller spatial level is questionable. The interference of the NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard) effect in the case of Castle Vale, had already led to a fifty percent reduction in the number of social sector houses to be developed on an empty plot adjacent to private sector houses. One of the respondents remarked that "one of the biggest problems with regeneration schemes is that you can be successful in terms of the economics for individuals, but when they do well they vote with their feet". People, when they no longer experience any financial constraints, are likely to move to an area which suffers less from a negative stigmatisation. Therefore, one may wonder if the policy of building expensive houses in a deprived area, could actually attract the potential buyers to uplift the character of the neighbourhood.

In general it may be concluded that the motive of keeping high incomes in the neighbourhood is considered to be more realistic than attracting high-income residents from elsewhere. The idea that people 'seek themselves out' is widely supported and therefore this last movement, in the eyes of many, is unlikely to occur. The common characteristic of the few successful examples of desegregation, according to a respondent at the Birmingham City Council, is the areas’ proximity to the city centre as a place of consumption and work.
CONCLUSIONS

As a result of a rapid de-industrialisation, a lack of investment, and increasing foreign competition the West Midlands conurbation has experienced an economic decline since the 1970s. The region became one of the most deprived areas in the country. The older centres of the towns and cities in particular were faced with increasing economic and social problems such as high unemployment rates, low average income levels, low schooling levels, poor health conditions and so forth. These problems became more pronounced with the suburbanisation of jobs and middle-class households to the more rural, surrounding communities. Those who didn’t take part in this movement were far removed from the locales where new jobs were available, and they faced increasing difficulties in finding a job to fit their (low) qualifications. The majority of people of minority ethnic background relied on low qualified, industrial work. Thus, they were hit most by the economic recession. Not surprisingly, there is a substantial overlap between the areas with large non-white populations and the areas with a low socio-economic profile, indicated by income and unemployment. The educational level, the unemployment levels, and the housing conditions of black and other minority ethnic groups vary greatly, however. There are two poverty areas located outside of the centre which have a white majority population. In addition, some areas have a large foreign population but are not deprived.

Based on the indicators income, unemployment, ethnicity, and two composite measures of deprivation, we conclude that there is spatial segregation both on the ward- and the ED-level within the city of Birmingham, and on the district level within the larger region. There is a positive correlation between the segregation of white from non-whites (as measured by the isolation index) and the minority ethnic group share of the population. Birmingham, with the highest proportion of non-whites, also has the highest segregation-score. Over a longer period (1981-1991) and based on the indicator ‘nationality’ geographical segregation seems to have declined. Because of missing incoming data for 1981, no longitudinal comparison could be made for this indicator. The unemployment data for 1981, 1991, and 1997 showed that Birmingham exceeds it's neighbour municipalities in their proportion of unemployed people. Between 1981 and 1991 it was the only city where unemployment still increased. Thus, regional segregation increased during this
decade. The unemployment data of January 1997 indicate that the tide has also turned for Birmingham. Nevertheless, unemployment is declining below the regional average rate.

The spatial distribution of poverty and residential segregation of black and other minority ethnic groups is related to the structure of the housing market. As a result of the right to buy policy, introduced by the conservative Thatcher administration, the social sector has become the sole resort for those people who are not able to buy a home. The result has been a marginalisation of this sector. The high rise estates in particular face the most social problems. But poverty is not confined to local authority housing. In two of Birmingham's poor inner city neighbourhoods, home-ownership forms the largest tenure.

Just over one tenth of Birmingham's disadvantaged households live in a house from an association. Because of the higher rent-levels and a reliance on housing benefits these residents are often trapped in a poverty situation.

Because of the lack of new investment in social housing and the stimulation of home-ownership, the (conservative) government has allowed segregation and the concentration of poor households in the remaining cheap rental sections of the housing market. In Birmingham, traditionally Labour supporting, there is more scepticism towards the right to buy policy. Social housing issues are not swept of the political agenda completely, so increased segregation is less extreme than in some other cities.

The British government in past and present has tried different efforts to regenerate deprived urban areas. The noticeable trends are an increasing centralisation and the shift from a sector approach to an area-based approach. Local authorities are increasingly surpassed by the national government in their decision making power also with regards to regeneration policies. The latest political answer is the installation of the Single Regeneration Budget (SRB), integrating programmes of different departments into an area-based regeneration strategy. All local authorities (including rural communities!) can bid for funding from this budget. Most of the successful bids prioritise economic development, whereas social issues and issues related to ethnic minorities seem to have lost importance. The Department of the Environment, which is the largest contributor to the SRB, is disadvantaged in the redistribution of the budget. The West Midlands, however, is somewhat exceptional since it is one of the few regions in which a relatively large sum of money is still spent on ethnic minority and housing issues. Overall, the efforts to fight poverty have concentrated mostly on job creation and training policies. All initiatives should levy from the private sector, which is to play an increasing social role. In addition, the involvement of the local community is also stimulated in the policy of the SRB. Parallel to the installation of the SRB, the government has cut back on main programmes, which benefited lower income groups and council housing. The introduction of special initiatives within the SRB has fallen short of the significance of the reduction in these main programmes.

Spatial segregation is not an issue of political debate in the UK, at least as long as it is not associated with deprivation. Deprived neighbourhoods are the result of a lack of jobs, insufficient educational qualifications of the local population and a general
economic decline. But the existence of deprived neighbourhoods is not seen by national policy makers as a factor which leads to a perpetuation of poverty and decline. Therefore, no examples were found of deliberate housing market policies aimed at the reduction or the prevention of spatial segregation. Desegregation through housing policies is considered to be a form of ‘social engineering’ and is not widely supported by the people. It is therefore unattractive politically. In practice, housing market restructuring is applied for different reason: the general improvement of the built environment of a run down area, the prevention of a flight of economically successful households, or the attraction of new investment. Generally, the practice of tenure diversification serves economic rather than social goals.

In March, 1997 the Labour government won the national elections for the first time in almost twenty years. This victory is likely to have many implications for urban policies. How exactly the changes will be carried through and what the impact of these changes will be is not clear at present. Almost certainly, this case-description (especially the sections on policy) would be of a different disposition written one year later. One important policy change is that the new government has committed itself to allowing municipalities to build council housing once again. The question remains whether municipalities will actually use this right. Under the ‘right-to-buy’ scheme, municipalities were prevented both from spending this money and from building new council houses. Many municipalities were using the interest from this saved capital to support their everyday spending. The expectation is that there will be some municipalities who are willing and able to use their resources to invest in council housing again. According to one of our respondents, it is almost certain that public spending in urban regions such as the West Midlands conurbation will be targeted on areas in greatest need, and will therefore have the greatest implications for the poor sections of the population.
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## List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRE</td>
<td>Commission of Racial Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoE</td>
<td>Department of the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Enumeration District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOR</td>
<td>Government Office of the Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAT</td>
<td>Housing Action Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILC</td>
<td>Index of Local Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAD</td>
<td>Local Authority District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCC</td>
<td>Metropolitan County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>National Exhibition Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG</td>
<td>Planning Policy Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPG</td>
<td>Regional Planning Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRB</td>
<td>Single Regeneration Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEC</td>
<td>Training and Enterprise Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDA</td>
<td>Urban Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDC</td>
<td>Urban Development Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDP</td>
<td>Urban Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT</td>
<td>Value Added Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMCC</td>
<td>West Midlands County Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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