



North East and North Cumbria's Child Health and Wellbeing Network

The Facts of Life for children and young people growing up in the North East and North Cumbria:

Chapter 1 – Resident population socio-demography
September 2021

@NorthNetChild





1 Resident population socio-demography	
1.1 Relevance	
1.2 Commentary and findings	
1.2.1 Demographics	
1.2.2 Population health outcomes	
1.2.3 Social determinants of population health	
1.3 Relevant key policy and research papers	







Tees Valley has the greatest population of 5-9yr olds, alongside the highest number of children in poverty.

Chapter One SPOTLIGHT to direct momentum for initiatives

1 Resident population socio-demography

1.1 Relevance

In order to fully understand the risk factors and outcomes associated with the other chapters of this report it is important to set the scene in terms of demographics and other non-health related indicators to start to examine the challenges and opportunities faced by the region.

1.2 Commentary and findings

1.2.1 Demographics

Age breakdowns by local authorities in the region are presented, providing contextual information to compare between areas and to support research and resource provision for age specific programmes and interventions.

As a region **North East and North Cumbria (NENC)** has broadly similar proportions of young people to England as a whole. However, there is variation across the region with greater proportions of 5-9 year olds in the **Tees Valley**, a much higher proportion of 20-24 year olds in **Newcastle upon Tyne**, and lower proportions across all 0-24 age groups in **Northumberland** and some of the North Cumbrian local authorities.





										Low	er tier lo	al author	ities						
					North C	Cumbria		North	of Tyne a	and Gates	shead		South T Sunderl	yneside and		T	ees Valle	У	
	Period	England	Region	Allerdale	Carlisle	Copeland	Eden	Gateshead	Newcastle upon Tyne	Northumberland	North Tyneside	County Durham	South Tyneside	Sunderland	Darlington	Hartlepool	Middlesbrough	Redcar and Cleveland	Stockton-on-Tees
Population aged 0-4 (Count and % of total population)	2020	3,239,447 5.7%	154,194 5.1%	4,395 4.5%	5,614	3,260 4.8%	2,147 4.0%	10,174 5.0%	16,383 5.3%	14,506 4.5%	11,256 5.4%	25,658 4.8%	8,130 5.4%	14,370 5.2%	5,692 5.3%	5,147 5.5%	9,431 6.7%	6,954 5.1%	11,077 5.6%
Population aged 5-9 (Count and % of total population)	2020	3,539,458 6.3%	173,222 5.8%	5,175 5.3%	6,329 5.8%	3,752 5.5%	2,589 4.8%	11,378 5.6%	17,375 5.7%	16,606 5.1%	11,928 5.7%	29,949	8,728 5.8%	16,080 5.8%	6,509	5,774 6.2%	9,840 7.0%	8,289	12,921
Population aged 10-14 (Count and % of total population)	2020	3,435,579 6.1%	172,737 5.7%	5,459 5.6%	6,151 5.7%	3,748 5.5%	2,776 5.2%	11,327 5.6%	16,469 5.4%	17,580 5.4%	12,162 5.8%	30,024 5.6%	8,594 5.7%	15,738 5.7%	6,674	5,982 6.4%	9,031	7,990 5.8%	13,032 6.6%
Population aged 15-19 (Count and % of total population)	2020	3,115,871 5.5%	162,601 5.4%	4,741 4.8%	5,525 5.1%	3,285 4.8%	2,459 4.6%	10,917 5.4%	21,041	15,920 4.9%	10,471 5.0%	29,348 5.5%	7,681 5.1%	14,390 5.2%	5,729 5.3%	5,126 5.5%	8,267 5.9%	6,952 5.1%	10,749 5.4%
Population aged 20-24 (Count and % of total population)	2020	4,197,633 7.4%	228,977 7.6%	5,614 5.7%	6,495	3,957 5.8%	2,691 5.0%	14,631 7.2%	46,881 15.3%	17,444 5.4%	12,042 5.8%	43,516 8.2%	9,823 6.5%	20,071 7.2%	6,538 6.1%	6,339	12,861 9.1%	8,575 6.2%	11,499 5.8%

Figure 1.1 – Resident population



										Lo	wer tier lo	cal author	ities						
					North C	Cumbria		Nort	h of Tyne	and Gate	shead		n, South T d Sunderl				Tees Vall	еу	
	Period	England	Region	Allerdale	Carlisle	Copeland	Eden	Gateshead	Newcastle upon Tyne	Northumberland	North Tyneside	County Durham	South Tyneside	Sunderland	Darlington	Hartlepool	Middlesbrough	Redcar and Cleveland	Stockton-on-Tees
% population from ethnic minorities (Persons, 16+, %)	2016	13.6	4.1	*	1.1	*	*	4.3	12.6	1.3	2.8	1.5	4.5	4.2	3.5	1.2	9.2	1.1	5.2

Figure 1.2 – Percentage of the population from ethnic minorities

To further understand the demographic profile of the region an indicator showing the percentage of people from an ethnic minority is displayed. Health outcomes and prevalence of risk factors can vary greatly by ethnicity and this should be considered when assessing population health needs. For example obesity prevalence in National Child Measurement Programme (NCMP)¹ data (Chapter 6) is higher in children in some Black and Asian ethnicities than the England average, while smoking rates in early pregnancy (Chapter 7) in these groups are significantly lower than the England average. All local authorities in the region have a lower percentage of the population from ethnic minorities than England (13.6%) with the highest percentages being **Newcastle upon Tyne** (12.6%) and **Middlesbrough** (9.2%).

1.2.2 Population health outcomes

Life expectancy and healthy life expectancy at birth are key summary outcome measures of population health included as overarching indicators in the public health outcomes framework for England². Life expectancy is an estimate of total length of life whereas healthy life expectancy shows the years a person can expect to live in good health (rather than with a disability or in poor health).

¹ https://digital.nhs.uk/services/national-child-measurement-programme/

² Public Health Outcomes Framework (2021): link



worse

similar

better



While a recent trend cannot be displayed by Fingertips, nationally and in the **North East region** life expectancy has increased in both males and females over time (in males by around 3 years from 2001-03 to 2010-12 and by 2 years in females in the same period), however the most recent years of data have showed this levelling off.

										Lo	wer tier lo	cal autho	rities						
					North (Cumbria		North	n of Tyne	and Gate	shead		m, South T Id Sunderl			7	Гees Valle		
	Period	England	Region	Allerdale	Carlisle	Copeland	Eden	Gateshead	Newcastle upon Tyne	Northumberland	North Tyneside	County Durham	South Tyneside	Sunderland	Darlington	Hartlepool	Middlesbrough	Redcar and Cleveland	Stockton-on-Tees
Life expectancy at birth - Male (All ages, years)	2017-19	79.8	ı	79.6	78.4	78.8	82.3	77.8	77.9	79.5	78.2	78.3	77.0	77.0	78.8	76.9	75.4	78.2	78.5
Life expectancy at birth - Female (All ages, years)	2017-19	83.4	-	82.3	82.9	81.7	85.4	81.8	81.9	82.8	82.0	81.8	81.8	81.4	81.9	81.3	80.3	81.8	81.7

Figure 1.3 - Life expectancy

At a locality level, the data indicate that on average:

- Within the **NENC region** most local authorities have a significantly lower life expectancy than England for both males and females, with the **Tees Valley** local authorities having particularly low values.
- For males, life expectancy in Allerdale (79.6) and Northumberland (79.5) are similar to England (79.8), with Eden significantly higher at 82.3.
- For females, life expectancy in Carlisle (82.9) is similar to England (83.4) and again Eden is significantly higher at 85.4.



Chart legend Significance compared with England



ignificance compared with England	worse	similar	better
igi iiiloanoo oomparoa man zinglana		Cirrinai	50110.

									Upper ti	er local a	uthorities					
				North Cumbria	North	of Tyne a	and Gates	shead		, South T d Sunderl				Tees Vall	ey	
	Period	England	Region	Cumbria	Gateshead	Newcastle upon Tyne	Northumberland	North Tyneside	County Durham	South Tyneside	Sunderland	Darlington	Hartlepool	Middlesbrough	Redcar and Cleveland	Stockton-on-Tees
Healthy life expectancy at birth - Male (All ages, years)	2017-19	63.2	-	62.9	58.2	61.0	60.9	60.6	59.6	60.4	57.5	58.1	57.0	58.5	60.2	57.8
Healthy life expectancy at birth - Female (All ages, years)	2017-19	63.5	-	66.0	59.7	58.7	61.7	59.3	58.3	58.5	57.3	62.2	57.4	58.5	60.3	56.8

Figure 1.4 – Healthy life expectancy

At a locality level, the data indicate that on average:

- Most of the **North East and Cumbria** has significantly lower healthy life expectancy (the number of years a person can expect to live in good health) than the England average.
- For males, healthy life expectancy in local authorities in the **North East and Cumbria** is significantly lower than the England average (63.2), other than **Cumbria** (62.9) which is similar.
- For females, healthy life expectancy in local authorities in the **North East and Cumbria** is significantly lower than the England (63.5) average other than **Cumbria** (66.0) which is significantly higher, and **Darlington** (62.2) which is similar.

Live indicators from this section can be viewed at https://fingertips.phe.org.uk/indicator-list/view/3wkrqU0VUe.





1.2.3 Social determinants of population health

Social determinants, also known as wider determinants, are a diverse range of social, economic and environmental factors which impact on population health. These factors, influenced by local, national and international distribution of resources, shape the conditions of daily life and the extent to which individuals of all ages have the physical, social and personal resources to identify and achieve goals, meet their needs and respond to changes in their circumstances³.

The Marmot review emphasised the strong and persistent link between social inequalities and disparities in health outcomes and the importance of tackling the wider determinants of health to improve health outcomes and reduce health inequalities⁴. Evidence suggests that these 'wider determinants of health' are more important than health care in ensuring a healthy population and reducing health inequality⁵ ⁶.

The purpose of this section is to present an overview of the social context, challenges and opportunities for children and families in the NENC region. It presents key summary metrics relating to the social determinants of health and compares how these vary within the region and against England averages. Further information with a greater focus on children and young people and specific determinants of their health and wellbeing is provided in the other chapters of this report.

Deprivation

The Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) is the official measure of relative deprivation in England and is part of a suite of outputs that form the Indices of Deprivation (IoD). It recognises that deprivation extends beyond financial resources i.e. people can be considered to be living in poverty if they lack the financial resources to meet their needs, whereas people can be regarded as deprived if they lack any kind of resources not just income⁷. Seven distinct domains of deprivation are recognised although the IMD awards different weightings to each one, the highest weightings are awarded to income and employment:

³ Wider determinants of health, PHE Fingertips: <u>link</u>

⁴ Marmot M. (2010) Fair society, healthy lives. Strategic review of health inequalities in England post 2010: link

⁵ PHE (2018) Health profile for England. Chapter 6: Wider Determinants of Health: link

⁶ Dahlgren, G. and Whitehead, M. (1993) Tackling inequalities in health: what can we learn from what has been tried?

⁷ Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2020) English indices of deprivation: <u>link</u>





- Income
- Employment
- · Health deprivation and disability
- · Education skills and training
- Crime
- Barriers to housing and services
- Living environment

Deprivation, as measured by the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), is an important measure to compare indicators of healthcare outcomes and behavioural risk factors. Most indicators used in this report can be displayed within Fingertips by deprivation decile at a national level in order to see association, and this will be discussed further throughout as an incredibly important factor influencing population health. This section also includes various other measures of deprivation in order to fully set the scene for the region and its constituent lower geographies.



Chart legend Significance compared with England Quintiles

wors	е	similar	b	etter
low				high



										Lo	wer tier lo	cal author	rities						
					North (Cumbria		Nort	h of Tyne	and Gate	shead		n, South T d Sunderl				Tees Vall	еу	
	Period	England	Region	Allerdale	Carlisle	Copeland	Eden	Gateshead	Newcastle upon Tyne	Northumberland	North Tyneside	County Durham	South Tyneside	Sunderland	Darlington	Hartlepool	Middlesbrough	Redcar and Cleveland	Stockton-on-Tees
Percentage living in 20% most deprived areas in England (Persons, All ages, %)	2014	20.2	29.4	20.3	16.2	24.9	0.0	24.8	35.2	17.2	21.4	27.1	46.2	38.2	22.7	44.7	57.2	35.8	28.1
Deprivation score (IMD2019) (Persons, All ages, IMD Score)	2019	21.7	-	22.9	22.0	25.0	16.3	28.2	29.8	22.1	22.3	26.8	31.5	30.6	25.7	35.0	40.5	29.8	25.8
Child Poverty, Income deprivation affecting children index (IDACI) (Persons, <16, %)	2019	17.1	-	15.1	14.9	16.4	8.7	20.4	24.7	17.4	17.9	22.2	26.7	24.2	20.3	28.3	32.7	25.6	20.9
Crime deprivation: score (Score)	2015	0.0	-	-0.4	-0.3	-0.4	-1.0	-0.3	-0.1	-0.8	-0.7	-0.2	-0.3	-0.2	0.2	0.1	0.6	0.0	-0.3
Income deprivation, English Indices of Deprivation (Persons, all ages, %)	2019	12.9	-	12.1	11.6	13.0	7.0	16.7	17.9	12.6	14.4	16.5	20.6	19.2	15.3	22.8	25.1	18.6	16.4

Figure 1.5 – Deprivation





The **NENC region** as a whole has a higher proportion (29.4%) living in the 20% most deprived areas of England than the national average (20.2%), and all of our local authorities with the exception of **Eden** have a higher IMD2019 deprivation score than the national average of 21.7.

At a locality level using the most recent available data:

- In Middlesbrough in 2014 57.2% of people lived in the 20% most deprived areas in England, almost three times the national average.
- The percentage in child poverty using the Income deprivation affecting children index (IDACI) varies across the region. The highest rates are in Tees Valley, particularly Middlesbrough (32.7%) which is almost twice that of England (17.1%).
 Middlesbrough also has the highest crime deprivation score (0.6) and the highest level of income deprivation (25.1%).
- For most indicators relating to deprivation North Cumbria has lower or similar values to the national average, with the
 exception of Copeland having 24.9% living in the 20% most deprived areas in England.

Other social determinants

This section displays indicators relating to employment and job seeking alongside other social determinants. Access to employment (good work) can result in greater disposable income and less deprivation, as well as contributing to better physical and mental health and wellbeing, whilst the opposite is linked to unemployment or poor work. For people with disabilities and long-term conditions employment can help to promote participation in society and improve wellbeing.

-

⁸ Is work good for your health and well-being (2006), Department of Work and Pensions: <u>link</u>



Chart legend Significance compared with England Significance compared with England

worse	similar	better
lower	similar	higher



													Lov	ver tier	loca	al auth	oritie	s													\Box
					North	Cumbri	ia		No	orth o	of Tyne	and G	ates	head		Durha a		South Sunde			e				T	ees \	/alle	у			
	Period	England	Region	Allerdale	Carlisle	Copeland		Eden	Gateshead		Newcastle upon Tyne	Northumberland		North Tyneside		County Durham		South Tyneside		Sunderland		Darlington		Hartlepool		Middlesbrough		Redcar and	Cleveland	Stockton-on-Tees	
Lone parent families: % of households (Persons, %)	2011	7.1	7.8	6.0	6.4	5.9	4	.3	7.8		7.6	6.2		7.9		7.7		9.6		8.3		8.7		9.7		10.4		8.6		8.6	
Percentage of people aged 16-64 in employment (Persons, 16-64 years, %)	2019/20	76.2	-	83.9	81.3	71.2	▶ 88	8.7 ▶	73.4	•	67.0	73.1	۰	79.1	•	71.4	▶ 6	59.9	٠	70.3	•	74.9	٠	68.1	•	65.2	۰	66.1	٠	72.7	•
Average weekly earnings (Persons, 16+ years, £)	2020	474.4	-	454.9	445.8	555.6	39	6.9	419.4	4	114.7	425.	3	457.3	4	434.1	4	32.1	2	16.2	2	126.3		439.8		391.8	3	410.5	;	435.	7
Long term claimants of Jobseeker's Allowance (Persons, 16-64 years, rate per 1,000)	2020	2.6 ▼	4.7	1.8	1.8	2.4	▼ 1	7 ▶	3.7	•	2.7	6.3	•	4.2	•	2.7	▼ 1	.0.0	•	7.4	١	5.8	١	3.7	▼	7.9	١	7.2	•	5.7	V
Statutory homelessness: rate per 1,000 households (Persons, all ages, rate per 1,000 households)	2017/18	2.4	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.7	•	*	2.4	Þ	1.7	1.2	•	1.9	>	0.6	•	0.9	•	0.7	•	0.4	•	0.8	Þ	0.4	•	0.6	•	0.4	A

Figure 1.6 – Other social determinants





On average, the data relating to the **NENC region** indicate that:

• The rate of long term claimants of Jobseekers Allowance and proportion in lone parent families are higher than the England average with some regional variation. The rate of statutory homelessness is lower in the **NENC region** (1.0 per 1,000 households) than the national average (2.4 per 1,000 households).

At a locality level using the most recent available data:

- The region varies greatly across these indicators, though the percentage in employment and average weekly earnings are lower than the England average for most of the region, ranging from Eden (88.7%) to Middlesbrough (65.2%).
- All local authorities other than **Northumberland** and those in **North Cumbria** have higher proportions of lone parent households than England.
- South Tyneside (10.0 per 1,000 population) had the highest rate of long term claimants of Jobseekers Allowance in the region. 10 of the 18 local authorities in the region have a higher rate than England.

									Upper t	ier local a	uthorities					
				North Cumbria	North	of Tyne a	and Gates	shead		n, South T d Sunderla			7	ees Valle	y	
	Period	England	Region	Cumbria	Gateshead	Newcastle upon Tyne	Northumberland	North Tyneside	County Durham	South Tyneside	Sunderland	Darlington	Hartlepool	Middlesbrough	Redcar and Cleveland	Stockton-on-Tees
Domestic abuse related incidents and crimes (Persons, 16+ years, rate per 1000)	2019/20	28.0 ▲	1	22.2	34.9	34.9	34.9	34.9	61.3	34.9	34.9	61.3	40.0	40.0	40.0	40.0

Figure 1.7 – Other social determinants – Upper tier local authority (note values based on the police force area present in the local authority)





 All police force areas in the North East and Cumbria have a higher rate of domestic abuse related incidents and crimes than the England average, other than Cumbria. Please note that Figure 1.7 is based on the police force area of the LA they are based in, e.g. Hartlepool, Middlesbrough, Redcar & Cleveland and Stockton-on-Tees are all covered by Cleveland Police and have the same value.

Live indicators from this section can be viewed at https://fingertips.phe.org.uk/indicator-list/view/ZsXIREwBTk.

1.3 Relevant key policy and research papers

Marmot M. (2010) Fair society, healthy lives. Strategic review of health inequalities in England post 2010 https://www.instituteofhealthequity.org/resources-reports/fair-society-healthy-lives-the-marmot-review/fair-society-healthy-lives-full-report-pdf.

Marmot M. et al (2020) Health Equity in England: The Marmot Review 10 Years On https://www.health.org.uk/publications/reports/the-marmot-review-10-years-on

PHE (2021) Supporting public health: children, young people and families https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/commissioning-of-public-health-services-for-children

Association for Young People's health (2016) A public health approach to promoting young people's resilience. http://www.youngpeopleshealth.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/resilience-resource-15-march-version.pdf

PHE (2018) Health profile for England. Chapter 6: Wider Determinants of Health <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/health-profile-for-england-2018/chapter-6-wider-determinants-of-health-profile-for-england-2018/chapter-6-wider-determinants-of-health-profile-for-england-2018/chapter-6-wider-determinants-of-health-profile-for-england-2018/chapter-6-wider-determinants-of-health-profile-for-england-2018/chapter-6-wider-determinants-of-health-profile-for-england-2018/chapter-6-wider-determinants-of-health-profile-for-england-2018/chapter-6-wider-determinants-of-health-profile-for-england-2018/chapter-6-wider-determinants-of-health-profile-for-england-2018/chapter-6-wider-determinants-of-health-profile-for-england-2018/chapter-6-wider-determinants-of-health-profile-for-england-2018/chapter-6-wider-determinants-of-health-profile-for-england-2018/chapter-6-wider-determinants-of-health-profile-for-england-2018/chapter-6-wider-determinants-of-health-profile-for-england-2018/chapter-6-wider-determinants-of-health-profile-for-england-2018/chapter-6-wider-determinants-of-health-profile-for-england-2018/chapter-6-wider-determinants-of-health-profile-for-england-2018/chapter-6-wider-determinants-of-health-profile-for-england-2018/chapter-6-wider-determinants-0-wider-de

Dahlgren, G. and Whitehead, M. (1993) Tackling inequalities in health: what can we learn from what has been tried?

Kings Fund (2012/13) Broader Determinants of health https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/projects/time-think-differently/trends-broader-determinants-health





Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (2019) The English Indices of Deprivation 2019 infographic https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/833959/IoD2019_Infographic.pdf

Children's Commissioner (2018) Growing up North https://www.childrenscommissioner.gov.uk/report/growing-up-north-a-generation-of-children-await-the-powerhouse-promise/

University of Liverpool and Centre for Local Economic Strategies (2014) Due North: the report of the inquiry on Health Equity for the North https://cles.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Due-North-Executive-summary-report-of-the-Inquiry-on-Health-Equity-in-the-North.pdf