The Midlands – highlights

Demos – PwC good growth for cities index: regional factsheet

2015

- As we found in 2014, when measured against the priorities chosen by the public, most cities in the Midlands achieve scores at or above the UK average for most categories.
- Table 1 sets out the scores for cities in the Midlands in comparison to the UK average in 2011-2013.
- As a whole, cities in the Midlands perform well on the following criteria:
  - **health**, where half of the cities in the region are above average, and half at the UK average level
  - **transport** and the **environment**, where all cities in the Midlands score around the UK average, or above in the cases of Coventry and Milton Keynes & Aylesbury respectively.
- Other notable features this year are that:
  - Coventry maintains its performance at or above the UK average on all measures
  - Stoke, Nottingham and Leicester are close behind with only measure each falling below average
  - Birmingham has lower than UK average scores for the heavily weighted measures of **jobs**, **income** and **skills**, pulling its position in the index down to no. 33
  - Leicester and Nottingham also score less well than average for **income**, but Nottingham's income **distribution** has improved from last year and is now up to average levels.
  - Milton Keynes & Aylesbury has the most wide-ranging score profile: it is above average for **jobs**, **income**, **health** and **environment**, but below average for **work-life-balance**, **sectoral balance**, **income distribution**. For housing it has a below average score for **house prices to earnings**, but above average for **owner occupation**.
- When compared with the index produced in 2014, the category with the largest improvement is jobs for all Midlands cities. The only exception is Nottingham, for which **income distribution** improved the most (by 0.97).
- In contrast, no one component stands out for the largest decrease since last year. While Leicester and Stoke-on-Trent saw their **work-life balance** score fall the most, the largest fall for Coventry and Birmingham was **income distribution**.

Table 1: Good growth for Midlands cities[1]

	Jobs	Income	Health	Work-life balance	Sectoral balance	House price to earnings	Owner occupation	Transport	Skills	Income distribu-tion	Environ-ment	Index Value (Rank in brackets)	Biggest increase since 2011-13	Biggest decrease since 2011-13
Birmingham	Red	Red	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Red	Amber	Red	Green	Amber	-0.31 (33)	Jobs ↑ 0.28	Income distribution ↓ -0.15
Leicester	Amber	Red	Green	Amber	Green	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Amber	0.25 (9)	Jobs ↑ 0.43	Work-life balance ↓ -0.4
Coventry	Amber	Amber	Green	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Amber	Amber	0.24 (10)	Jobs ↑ 0.11	Income distribution ↓ -0.38
Milton Keynes & Aylesbory	Green	Green	Green	Red	Red	Red	Green	Amber	Amber	Red	Green	0.11 (15)	Jobs ↑ 0.32	Health -0.47 ↓
Nottingham	Amber	Red	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	-0.01 (21)	Income distribution ↑ 0.97	Transport -0.26 ↓
Stoke-on-Trent	Green	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Amber	Green	Amber	Red	Amber	Amber	0.03 (19)	Jobs ↑ 0.44	Work-life balance ↓ -0.45

Key: Red = Below average relative to the Index for all cities; Amber = Around average; Green = Above average

Source: PwC analysis

- Table 2 overleaf summarises the same results for the eleven Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) within the Midlands.
- Worcestershire and Coventry and Warwickshire are particularly strong performers, ranking 3rd and 10th respectively. In particular, it is worth noting that Coventry and Warwickshire has scores at, or above, the UK average for all of the categories.
- All LEPs were at or above average for **transport**, and the majority at or above average for **jobs**, **sectoral balance** and **house price to earnings**.
- On the other hand, the majority of the region is at or below average for **income** and **skills**.
- For 5 of the 11 LEPs, the component which deteriorated the most from last year was related to housing, either **owner occupation** or **house price to earnings**.
- **Jobs** was the common component which saw the largest improvement from last year for most of the LEPs, as employment in the region finally picked up.

[1] The Office for National Statistics defines Travel To Work Areas (TTWAs) as labour market areas where the bulk (75% or more) of the resident economically active population work in the area and also, of everyone working in the area, at least 75% actually live in the area. We recognise that TTWAs vary considerably depending on city characteristics and for different segments of the population (e.g. wealthier commuters who may be able to live outside standard TTWAs).

Table 2: *Good growth for Midlands LEPs*

	Jobs	Income	Health	Work-life balance	Sectoral balance	House price to earnings	Owner occupation	Transport	Skills	Income distribu-tion	Environ-ment	Index Value (Rank in brackets)	Biggest increase since 2011-13	Biggest decrease since 2011-13
The Midlands														
Derby, Derbyshire, Nottingham and Nottinghamshire	🟡	🔴	🔴	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟢	🟡	0.01 (23)	Income distribution ↑ +0.23	Health ↓ -0.18
Leicester and Leicestershire	🟡	🔴	🟢	🟡	🟢	🟢	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟢	🟡	0.2 (15)	Jobs ↑ +0.59	Work-life balance ↓ -0.23
Greater Birmingham and Solihull	🔴	🔴	🟡	🟢	🟡	🟢	🔴	🟡	🔴	🟡	🟡	-0.32 (32)	Jobs ↑ +0.32	Owner occupation ↓ -0.1
Coventry and Warwickshire	🟢	🟡	🟢	🟡	🟡	🟢	🟡	🟢	🟡	🟢	🟡	0.3 (10)	Jobs ↑ +0.39	Income distribution ↓ -0.12
The Marches	🟢	🟡	🔴	🟡	🟡	🔴	🟡	🟡	🔴	🔴	🟡	-0.1 (27)	Jobs ↑ +0.42	House price to earnings ↓ -0.12
Greater Lincolnshire	🟡	🔴	🔴	🔴	🟢	🟢	🟡	🟢	🔴	🟡	🔴	-0.27 (30)	Jobs ↑ +0.51	Owner occupation ↓ -0.11
Stoke-on-Trent and Staffordshire	🟢	🔴	🔴	🟡	🟡	🟢	🟢	🟢	🔴	🟢	🟡	0.05 (21)	Work-life balance ↑ +0.14	Owner occupation ↓ -0.11
Black Country	🔴	🔴	🔴	🟢	🟢	🟢	🔴	🟡	🔴	🟢	🟡	-0.49 (38)	Jobs ↑ +0.32	Transport ↓ -0.17
Worcestershire	🟢	🟡	🟢	🟢	🟢	🔴	🟢	🟡	🟡	🔴	🟡	0.48 (3)	Jobs ↑ +0.2	Transport ↓ -0.17
Northamptonshire	🟢	🟡	🟡	🔴	🟢	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟡	0.06 (20)	Work-life balance ↑ +0.37	Health ↓ -0.27
South East Midlands	🟢	🟡	🟢	🔴	🔴	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟢	0.16 (17)	Jobs ↑ +0.26	House price to earnings ↓ -0.18

Key: 🔴 = Below average relative to the Index for all cities; 🟡 = Around average 🟢 = Above average

Source: PwC analysis

John Hawksworth
Chief UK Economist

+44 (0) 20 7213 1650
john.c.hawksworth@uk.pwc.com

Nick C Jones
Director of Public Sector Research Centre

+44 (0) 20 7213 1593
nick.c.jones@uk.pwc.com

151027-101247-CC-UK