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| **Feedback** | **Response** |
| C: Suburban Asian Communities – I found this one a little curious because it concerns neighbourhoods with Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi ‘influences’.  I’m wondering whether the term influences also means *numbers of residents,*as I’ve tended to find that Indian residents often don’t live in the same areas as Bangladeshi, certainly in Enfield – but then perhaps Enfield is not typical of other parts of London.  We have tended to observe Indian families being in the more prosperous areas, with Bangladeshi households being in the more deprived areas.  Pakistani families, on the other hand, are spread between the two.  Obviously if the LOAC creators have found that there are distinct clusters involving all of these groups, we can’t argue with that, however. | There are generally differences in how “Asian communities” are organised over Greater London.  The incidence of residents identifying with Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi ethnic groups by the Super Group Clusters is show in Table 1.  **Table 1: Index Scores for Bangladeshi, Indian and Pakistani Ethnic Groups by LOAC Super Groups (100 = London Average; 200 double the London Average; 50 half the London Average)**   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | | Bangladeshi | 14 | 53 | 171 | 59 | 269 | 112 | 22 | | Indian | 45 | 47 | 311 | 83 | 43 | 55 | 117 | | Pakistani | 28 | 59 | 329 | 44 | 63 | 111 | 66 |   Super Group C is more integrated with all three groups over represented relative to the London average, with Super Group F having lower prevalence of Indian ethnicity. This Super Group is prevalent (yellow) to the east of Enfield  Figure 1: A Map of Super Groups in Enfield. |
| G:  The use of the word ‘Ageing’ in any segment description makes me wince slightly, as it sounds pejorative to my ears.  Besides, isn’t everyone ageing all the time?  I feel the term ‘Mature’ or even ‘Older’ would be better.  Having said that, I’m not hung up on it – it’s just a thought. | We have amended this label; however, we recently completed some work with a range of external partners related to ageing populations who preferred this term. CDRC has an “Ageing in Place” classification: <https://data.cdrc.ac.uk/dataset/ageing-place-classification-aipc> which was created as part of a wider project with the Nuffield Foundation. |
| The predominant supergroups on the interactive map looked plausible, although I appreciate that the strength of the predominant supergroup will vary enormously between LSOAs.  When I now look at LOAC it looks as though we are really hung up on ethnic group . . . whereas for Local Authorities we might be more interested in other aspects (e.g. understanding English, overcrowded housing, etc) for which we sometimes use ethnic group as a rather blunt proxy.    What would happen if we removed ethnic group entirely . . . would the supergroups still stand up? | On the one hand we are aiming to mirror as close as possible the ONS methodology for the national classification, which includes these variables. We are also mindful that the 2011 LOAC was commissioned in part as a response to much of London being lumped together in a bland ‘multi ethnic areas’ Supergroup. We do also include a measure of use of English at home and also include country of birth data.  In response, we have tested your idea of excluding ethnicity. The resulting clustergram confirmed 7 clusters would still be optimal with these adjusted inputs, shown in Figure 2.  What this shows is that for some areas where ethnicity isn’t a particularly influential set of variables, between LOAC (with ethnicity) and LOAC (without ethnicity) there are relatively limited changes; however for LOAC\_E Super Group C, F there are considerable changes. C in particular becomes unhelpfully large relative to the other clusters, and F is reconstituted from other clusters. |
| Groups C And G have the suburban geography component, which immediately renders them irrelevant to us as a central London borough. I think this is a shame an understanding of the location of these communities in our borough, particularly older communities, could play an important role in policy decisions. | C and G emerge as these have very different characteristics to central London; and it is unlikely these blends of attributes would be found outside of these locations. In any geodemographic, there are clusters which emerge in adjacent locations, which is an indication that the algorithm is working effectively. |
| We know our borough is very polarised with regard to deprivation, with some very deprived areas in the north, and very wealthy areas in the south. From looking at the map this seems to roughly equate to a large proportion of As and Ds in the south (which tracks) and then a mix of Es and Bs in the North (I think – it’s tricky to eyeball without the borough boundary). A couple of thoughts on this, I think in the meet on Tuesday we discussed the group B as being the somewhat homogeneous areas that don’t have particular defining characteristics? So I was quite surprised to see so much of this supergroup in an area where we know we have our highest levels of needs. I’m curious at to whether the census dimensions of deprivation factored into this analysis at all? On the one hand I think this is quite an important part of the picture for us, but on the other I do quite like that the groupings tell us something different about our deprived areas, beyond the fact they are deprived! | We will add the borough boundaries to the online map for the consultation phase which should help picking out these extents relative to LOAC 21.  Deprivation is factored to an extent as it will correlate with elements of the Census inputs to LOAC. However LOAC isn’t a measure of deprivation in itself. The key difference (and why we are proponents of geodemographics) is these types or urban indicators tell you more about the variable circumstance in which people live, offering more suggestions about what sort of interventions might be useful in these contexts. The very first geodemographics were built for the City of Liverpool in the 1970s, and were created specifically as a method to target deprivation alleviation funding. |
| My gut reaction to looking at geographic breakdown is that I’m not sure how helpful the supergroups, particularly the ones we have represented in RBKC would be for informing policy decisions. I’d be really keen to understand the subgroups sitting below the supergroups, as I’m wondering if it might be a case of focusing on some specific groups for our borough. | Hopefully seeing the Group level partitions will illustrate that there should be plenty of useful differentiation for your purposes (Figure 2).  **Figure 2: Group Map for Kensington and Chelsea** |
| Stakeholder Consultation Meeting 1 Comments –  There was general dislike of the initial label “Ethnic Communities” for Super Group E. – Alternative suggestions include “Young Adults and Young Families” or “Social Renters, Many with Children”.    It was also suggested that in cluster E there needed to be more care with the terms high density housing v over crowding.  Super Group B original name was also deemed problematic as didn’t include all of Greater London – there was a suggestion of “Professional Mix” | Super Group E has now been changes to “Social Renters, Many with Children” and general changes to the text now tighten the use of some terms.  We continue to agonise about Super Group B, and are reluctant to use “Professional Mix” as the occupational and employment structure does not strongly support this. Part of the rationale for the original 2011 LOAC was that London’s population (and specifically ethnic) mix was greater than for the UK as a whole. We still think that this should be a distinctive characteristic of what in some respects is a baseline Super Group to the classification. We have had a go with “**The Greater London Mix**” to emphasise this distinctiveness (and perhaps even its inherent superiority!) and would welcome further comments. |
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**Figure 2: A Comparison Between OAC Super Groups with Ethnic Groups included (left) and Ethnic Groups excluded (right), with the flows representing the total population switches between Super Groups before and after excluding ethnicity..**