### **CITY** INTELLIGENCE

# Indices of Deprivation 2019 Ward level summary measures for London

April 2020

#### **Key points**

- The Indices of Deprivation 2019 (ID2019) are the Government's primary measure of deprivation for small areas (known as LSOAs) in England
- The LSOA deprivation measures are summarised nationally for various administrative areas, such as local authorities, parliamentary constituencies and health areas
- This note describes the methodology and presents initial results for a series of measures summarising the Indices of Deprivation 2019 for London wards
- Many of the summary measures highlight the same wards as having the highest levels of deprivation in London. Among these are Northumberland Park in Haringey, Golborne in Kensington & Chelsea and Stonebridge in Brent.

#### The measures include:

- Ward level summary measures replicating those produced at local authority level
- Additional measures based on the Index of Multiple Deprivation
- Further measures based on other LSOA measures, including those relating to income, employment, income deprivation affecting children and affecting older people

Accompanying this note is a spreadsheet that includes the full set of measures estimated for every ward in London.

#### Introduction

The Indices of Deprivation 2019 (ID2019) are the Government's primary measure of deprivation for small areas (known as LSOAs) in England. They replace and update the Indices of Deprivation 2015. The main index is the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), which combines measures across seven distinct aspects of deprivation. In addition, there are two supplementary indices, measuring income deprivation affecting children and affecting older people.

It is vital to measure deprivation at small area level, but there is also a need to understand how deprivation varies between larger areas. While no attempt is made to to produce actual IMD scores directly for these larger areas, the LSOA deprivation measures are summarised for various adminstrative areas, such as local authorities, parliamentary constituencies and health areas. There is also, however, a need for such measures to be available for wards. Because Wards across England vary significantly in size and population, with some wards smaller than a single LSOA and others more than ten times the size of an average LSOA, summary measures for wards are not produced by the government. Wards in London, however, are generally much larger than average and are more consistent in population size, so the GLA has calculated summary measures for London's wards that reflect those published by MHCLG for local authorities across England.

#### Methodology

The local authority level measures published by MHCLG summarise the LSOA level data in different ways, all of which are valid and so none of these summary measures gives a "better" summary than other perspectives. Each has its merits. This ward level summarisation gives alternative and additional measures, to reflect these different perspectives including a ward level version of the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) and Income Deprivation Affecting Older People Index (IDAOPI).

This analysis uses ward boundaries current from 2018, though it is important to note that the ID 2019, though published in 2019 are based largely on administrative data from 2015 and 2016. For most boroughs in London, LSOAs nest within wards, which means that the ward level measures summarise in various ways those LSOAs. For seven boroughs, however, there have been changes to the ward boundaries since the 2011 LSOAs were created, meaning that some additional processing was needed for these boroughs. The seven boroughs are Bexley, Croydon, Hackney, Kensington & Chelsea, Redbridge, Southwark and Tower Hamlets. Additionally, following the 2011 Census, LSOA boundaries were checked to ensure that they still met the criteria for the minimum and maximum population and households. Where they were not met, LSOAs were merged or redrawn. In the case of Hillingdon this resulted in two 2001 LSOAs being merged from neighbouring wards, so although ward boundaries did not change, the 2011 LSOA is split between the wards, and that is processed in the same way as the boroughs with ward boundary changes. The City of London is treated as a single ward in this analysis.

An apportionment method was used to allocate LSOAs to wards. A number of rules and assumptions were used in this process. The apportionment was done on the basis of residential address points, using boundaries of LSOAs and wards held by the GLA. If the differences were very small, then the whole LSOA was allocated to the ward. The cut-off level adopted was five percent, so if less than five per cent of addresses in an LSOA were in ward A, while more than 95 per cent were in ward B, then the whole LSOA was allocated to ward B. In reality, where this rule was applied the differences were in most cases less than one per cent, and this was believed to be due simply to the accuracy of the digitisation of the boundaries rather than any real differences. Where more than five per cent of an LSOA's addresses were in each of at least two different wards, the population of the LSOA were apportioned between those wards according to the number of residential addresses. The implicit assumptions in this method are a) that the population is equally distributed across address points within the LSOA and b) that deprivation is experienced equally

across areas and households of each LSOA. While we recognise that this will not always be the case, we have no available evidence to make alternative assumptions.

#### Ward level summary measures replicating those published at LA level

The ward level summary measures replicating those at LA level produced here are:

- Average of LSOA Scores
- Average of LSOA Ranks
- Extent

The calculations for these are as close as possible to those for the LA level measures and full detail of the calculations are given below.

The Average of LSOA Scores measure describes the ward as a whole and is a population weighted average for the ward. This is calculated by first multiplying the IMD score for each LSOA by the population estimate for that LSOA. Where an LSOA is split between wards, a proportion of the population equivalent to the proportion of the LSOA's addresses falling within that ward is multiplied by the IMD score for that LSOA. These figures are then summed across all LSOAs and part LSOAs within the ward and the result is divided by the total population for that ward (the sum of the LSOA population estimates). This measure takes into account the full range of scores within the ward and the number of people affected by the level of deprivation in each LSOA. The Rank of Average Scores is the rank across London wards, with 1 being the most deprived and 633 being the least deprived.

The London ward with the highest score averaged across all its constituent LSOAs was Golborne in Kensington & Chelsea. Both Kensington & Chelsea and Haringey have three wards in the top twenty, topped only by Hackney, with four wards. Most of the wards with the highest average LSOA IMD score are in Inner London. At the other end of the scale, the ward with the lowest average score is Petts Wood and Knoll in Bromley. Altogether, there were four Bromley wards among the twenty London wards with the lowest average LSOA IMD score along with five wards in Richmond upon Thames. Just one of the wards with an average score in the lowest twenty was in Inner London – Froqnal and Fitzjohns in Camden.

The Average of LSOA Ranks measure again takes into account the full range of deprivation across each ward but using the ranks of LSOAs rather than the scores. Again, it is calculated using the population figures to take account of variation in LSOA sizes, so it is a population weighted average of LSOA ranks within each ward, but with the ranks reversed, so that the most deprived LSOA is ranked 32844 and the least deprived is ranked 1, but this is again reversed for the output so that the lower numbered ranks are the most deprived. The Rank of Average Ranks is the rank across London wards, with 1 being the most deprived and 633 being the least deprived.

The wards with the highest and lowest average rank are largely those with the highest and lowest average scores, with little difference in the ordering.

Table 1 London wards with the highest and lowest average score on IMD 2019

Ward Name	Borough	IMD average score	Rank of IMD average score
Golborne	Kensington and Chelsea	46.6	1
Northumberland Park	Haringey	46.5	2
Stonebridge	Brent	45.3	3
White Hart Lane	Haringey	42.3	4
Edmonton Green	Enfield	41.9	5
Church Street	Westminster	41.5	6
Woodberry Down	Hackney	41.3	7
Hackney Wick	Hackney	40.8	8
Notting Dale	Kensington and Chelsea	40.3	9
Harlesden	Brent	39.6	10
Dalgarno	Kensington and Chelsea	39.5	11
Lansbury	Tower Hamlets	39.2	12
Tottenham Green	Haringey	38.7	13
Homerton	Hackney	38.6	14
New Addington North	Croydon	38.2	15
Mayesbrook	Barking and Dagenham	38.2	16
Haggerston	Hackney	37.8	17
Selhurst	Croydon	37.3	18
Gascoigne	Barking and Dagenham	37.1	19
Bellingham	Lewisham	37.1	20
Frognal and Fitzjohns	Camden	7.1	614
Nonsuch	Sutton	7.0	615
Pinner South	Harrow	6.8	616
Ickenham	Hillingdon	6.8	617
Upminster	Havering	6.8	618
Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom	Bromley	6.7	619
Dundonald	Merton	6.6	620
Hillside	Merton	6.6	621
Monkhams	Redbridge	6.5	622
Twickenham Riverside	Richmond upon Thames	6.5	623
Shortlands	Bromley	6.3	624
Tudor	Kingston upon Thames	6.3	625
East Sheen	Richmond upon Thames	6.3	626
St. Margarets and North Twickenham	Richmond upon Thames	6.3	627
West Wickham	Bromley	6.2	628
Teddington	Richmond upon Thames	6.1	629
Cheam	Sutton	6.0	630
Village	Merton	5.9	631
South Twickenham	Richmond upon Thames	5.5	632
Petts Wood and Knoll	Bromley	5.0	633

Table 2 London wards with the highest and lowest average rank on IMD 2019

Ward Name	Borough	IMD Average rank	IMD average rank
Northumberland Park	Haringey	2975.4	1
Golborne	Kensington and Chelsea	3035.3	2
Stonebridge	Brent	3229.7	3
White Hart Lane	Haringey	3747.2	4
Edmonton Green	Enfield	3912.7	5
Church Street	Westminster	4185.5	6
Notting Dale	Kensington and Chelsea	4420.5	7
Woodberry Down	Hackney	4551.2	8
Hackney Wick	Hackney	4719.9	9
Lansbury	Tower Hamlets	4769.4	10
Harlesden	Brent	4812.3	11
Mayesbrook	Barking and Dagenham	4849.4	12
New Addington North	Croydon	4863.8	13
Homerton	Hackney	4931.1	14
Dalgarno	Kensington and Chelsea	5110.3	15
Tottenham Green	Haringey	5190.9	16
Haggerston	Hackney	5209.1	17
Gascoigne	Barking and Dagenham	5265.1	18
Selhurst	Croydon	5453.9	19
Valence	Barking and Dagenham	5631.8	20
Frognal and Fitzjohns	Camden	28123.6	614
Upminster	Havering	28150.0	615
Nonsuch	Sutton	28154.6	616
Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom	Bromley	28314.1	617
Ickenham	Hillingdon	28392.5	618
Pinner South	Harrow	28407.1	619
Hillside	Merton	28675.4	620
Dundonald	Merton	28708.7	621
Monkhams	Redbridge	28736.5	622
Twickenham Riverside	Richmond upon Thames	28777.2	623
Shortlands	Bromley	28921.7	624
Tudor	Kingston upon Thames	28947.0	625
Teddington	Richmond upon Thames	28970.1	626
St. Margarets and North Twickenham	Richmond upon Thames	29026.3	627
Cheam	Sutton	29033.5	628
West Wickham	Bromley	29059.7	629
East Sheen	Richmond upon Thames	29067.1	630
Village	Merton	29460.7	631
South Twickenham	Richmond upon Thames	29940.8	632
Petts Wood and Knoll Source: GLA calculations from Indices of	Bromley	30221.4	633

Thus, it counts the people in the most deprived LSOAs only. It counts the total population for any LSOA ranked in the top ten per cent in England, and then, in order to avoid a crude cut-off, it also includes a portion of the population in the next 20 per cent on a graduated scale, so that 100 per cent of the population count for LSOAs with a rank between the tenth and eleventh percentiles is included, 95 per cent of the population count for LSOAs with a rank between the eleventh and twelfth percentiles etc down to five per cent of the population count for LSOAs with a rank between the twenty-ninth and thirtieth percentiles. None of the population in areas ranked lower than this is included on this measure. For split LSOAs, the proportion of the population within the ward is given the appropriate multiplier, so if the LSOA falls in the most deprived ten per cent then all the population apportioned to that ward would be counted.

Eg, for an LSOA with a rank of 28,000 falling into two wards with two thirds in Ward A and one third in Ward B. It's rank falls between the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> percentiles where 80 per cent of the population would be included. Thus the population included in Ward A for the extent measure would be calculated as:

Total population \*2/3 \* 0.8

The *Rank of Extent* is the rank across London wards, with 1 being the most deprived and 427 being the least deprived, as this represents no population in that ward falling in the most deprived 29 per cent of LSOAs in England.

Again, the wards ranked highest on the extent measure are largely the same as those ranked highest on average score and average rank. In total there are 196 wards in London with a zero percentage on the extent measure, or no LSOAs in the 30 per cent most deprived LSOAs in England. These wards are in 27 of the London boroughs.

Table 3 London wards with the highest and lowest extent summary measure of IMD 2019

Ward Name	Borough	IMD Extent %	IMD Extent Rank
Northumberland Park	Haringey	94%	1
Golborne	Kensington and Chelsea	94%	2
Stonebridge	Brent	93%	3
White Hart Lane	Haringey	93%	4
Edmonton Green	Enfield	89%	5
Notting Dale	Kensington and Chelsea	88%	6
Church Street	Westminster	83%	7
Lansbury	Tower Hamlets	79%	8
Mayesbrook	Barking and Dagenham	78%	9
New Addington North	Croydon	78%	10
Homerton	Hackney	76%	11
Woodberry Down	Hackney	75%	12
Harlesden	Brent	75%	13
Hackney Wick	Hackney	73%	14
Gascoigne	Barking and Dagenham	73%	15
Haggerston	Hackney	72%	16
Tottenham Green	Haringey	70%	17
Selhurst	Croydon	69%	18
Bellingham	Lewisham	68%	19
Dalgarno	Kensington and Chelsea	68%	20

#### Other ward level summary measures derived from IMD

The LA level Concentration measure cannot be sensibly reproduced at ward level, since it is based on ten per cent of the area's population, which is in most cases less than a single LSOA. Instead, a summary measure based on highest ranked LSOA in the ward is included. This effectively answers the same question of "how deprived are the most deprived people in the area?". An LSOA is only included as the most deprived for that ward if at least ten per cent of the LSOA's residential addresses fall within that ward. There are 11 cases, where an LSOA that is split between wards ranks highest in both wards.

All of the twenty wards with the highest ranking LSOAs within them include the whole LSOA. While some of these wards are the same as those falling into the top twenty on other summary measures, some are different, so there are alternative wards from the same boroughs shown among the top on other measures, and some wards from boroughs not featured in the top twenty, such as Ealing and Islington. Havering includes wards in both the top twenty and bottom twenty wards in London on this measure.

Table 4 London wards with the highest and lowest ranked LSOA of IMD 2019

		Rank of	
Ward Name	Borough	most deprived LSOA	% LSOA ii ward
West Green	Haringey	546	100%
Golborne	Kensington and Chelsea	1012	100%
West Thornton	Croydon	1096	100%
Stonebridge	Brent	1192	100%
Hackney Wick	Hackney	1315	100%
Northumberland Park	Haringey	1411	100%
Jubilee	Enfield	1643	100%
Tottenham Green	Haringey	1685	100%
Harlesden	Brent	1713	100%
Dalgarno	Kensington and Chelsea	1794	100%
Church Street	Westminster	1850	100%
King's Park	Hackney	1876	100%
Willesden Green	Brent	2011	100%
Cleveland	Ealing	2075	100%
Fulham Broadway	Hammersmith and Fulham	2073	100%
Faraday	Southwark	2115	100%
Junction	Islington	2113	100%
Gooshays	Havering	2104	100%
New Addington South	Croydon	2163	100%
Isleworth	Hounslow	2247	100%
isiewortii	HOUITSIOW	2294	100%
St. Margarets and North Twickenham	Richmond upon Thames	22428	100%
Bickley	Bromley	22579	100%
Emerson Park	Havering	22617	100%
Lower Morden	Merton	22958	100%
Pinner South	Harrow	23375	100%
Manor	Hillingdon	23632	100%
Cheam	Sutton	23943	100%
West Wickham	Bromley	24041	100%
lckenham	Hillingdon	24176	100%
Petts Wood and Knoll	Bromley	24258	100%
Shortlands	Bromley	24387	100%
Nonsuch	Sutton	24781	100%
Tudor	Kingston upon Thames	25452	100%
Hillside	Merton	25722	100%
Village	Merton	25790	100%
Fulwell and Hampton Hill	Richmond upon Thames	25837	100%
Twickenham Riverside	Richmond upon Thames	26696	100%
Dundonald	Merton	27029	100%
East Sheen	Richmond upon Thames	27029	100%
South Twickenham	•		
South Twickennam ource: GLA calculations from Indices of	Richmond upon Thames F Deprivation 2019, MHCLG	29211	100%

The LA level measure *Proportion of LSOAs in most deprived 10% nationally* is expanded to give at ward level the total number of LSOAs included (which does not have to be a whole number), and the number in the most deprived 5%, 10% 20% and 50% to give maximum flexibility to users.

Just six London wards include at least one LSOA among the most deprived five per cent of LSOAs in England and nineteen wards include more than one LSOA in the top 10 per cent in England. There are a further 58 wards with at least part of one LSOA in the most deprived ten per cent of LSOAs in England.

Table 5 London wards with at least one LSOA in most deprived 5 per cent or more than one LSOA

in the most deprived ten per cent in England

Ward Name	Borough	# of	# LSOAs in	# LSOAs in	# LSOAs in	# LSOAs in
ward walle	Borougii	LSOAs	worst 5%	worst 10%	worst 20%	worst 50%
Stonebridge	Brent	10.00	1.00	6.00	10.00	10.00
Northumberland Park	Haringey	8.00	2.00	6.00	8.00	8.00
Golborne	Kensington and Chelsea	5.91	2.00	4.00	5.91	5.91
Woodberry Down	Hackney	5.71	0.00	4.00	4.00	5.71
Hackney Wick	Hackney	7.00	1.00	3.00	6.00	7.00
Harlesden	Brent	8.00	0.00	3.00	6.00	8.00
Edmonton Green	Enfield	10.00	0.00	3.00	9.00	10.00
Dalgarno	Kensington and Chelsea	4.62	0.00	2.58	2.68	4.62
West Green	Haringey	8.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	8.00
Tottenham Green	Haringey	8.00	0.00	2.00	6.00	8.00
Church Street	Westminster	7.00	0.00	2.00	6.00	7.00
Faraday	Southwark	8.39	0.00	2.00	5.30	8.39
Custom House	Newham	8.00	0.00	2.00	5.00	8.00
Finsbury Park	Islington	8.00	0.00	2.00	5.00	8.00
White Hart Lane	Haringey	8.00	0.00	2.00	8.00	8.00
South Acton	Ealing	9.00	0.00	2.00	3.00	7.00
Lewisham Central	Lewisham	11.00	0.00	2.00	3.00	11.00
Homerton	Hackney	6.27	0.00	1.44	5.27	6.27
Springfield	Hackney	9.02	0.00	1.42	4.87	9.02
West Thornton	Croydon	11.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	10.00

Source: GLA calculations from Indices of Deprivation 2019, MHCLG

#### Ward level summary measures derived from other LSOA measures

Further summary measures are given where the LSOA level measure is a simple proportion of the population. These are the

- Income Scale, Score and Rank
- Employment Scale, Scoree and Rank
- IDACI Scale, Score and Rank
- IDAOPI Scale, Score and Rank

The Income Scale measure gives a count of the number of people living in households in income deprivation. It is calculated by multiplying the income score for each LSOA or part LSOA by the population

for that LSOA or part LSOA. These are then summed across LSOAs within each ward to give the income score for the ward.

The Income Score measure is equivalent to the Income Deprivation domain at ward level and is the proportion of the total population for the ward living in income deprivation, calculated as the Income Scale measure divided by the total population.

The Income Rank measure is the rank of the Income Score across all London wards, with 1 being the most deprived and 644 being the least deprived.

Looking at the wards with the highest and lowest income scores, many are the same as those featuring on the top and bottom of some of the other measures, though there are some differences.

Two wards – Church Street in Westminster and Golborne in Kensington & Chelsea show more than 30 per cent of residents living in income deprivation, with a further eleven wards above 25 per cent. Altogether 29 wards have fewer than ten per cent of population in income deprivation.

Table 6 London wards with the highest and lowest income score

Ward Name	Borough	Income scale number	Income Score	Incom Rank
Church Street	Westminster	3966.7	0.313	1
Golborne	Kensington and Chelsea	2622.2	0.311	2
Notting Dale	Kensington and Chelsea	2471.7	0.290	3
Northumberland Park	Haringey	4500.3	0.287	4
Lansbury	Tower Hamlets	5136.3	0.275	5
Dalgarno	Kensington and Chelsea	1833.4	0.274	6
Stonebridge	Brent	4794.6	0.274	7
Edmonton Green	Enfield	5317.6	0.273	8
White Hart Lane	Haringey	3703.6	0.270	9
Woodberry Down	Hackney	2678.3	0.269	10
Westbourne	Westminster	3653.6	0.267	11
New Addington North	Croydon	2935.0	0.265	12
Queen's Park	Westminster	3392.9	0.251	13
Bromley North	Tower Hamlets	2926.8	0.249	14
Harlesden	Brent	4351.4	0.247	15
Hackney Wick	Hackney	3129.9	0.247	16
Homerton	Hackney	3288.2	0.246	17
King's Park	Hackney	3251.3	0.246	18
Peckham	Southwark	3601.3	0.245	19
Wormholt and White City	Hammersmith and Fulham	3241.3	0.244	20
Northcote	Wandsworth	719.1	0.045	614
St. Mark's	Kingston upon Thames	573.1	0.045	615
Frognal and Fitzjohns	Camden	605.3	0.044	616
Monkhams	Redbridge	381.8	0.042	617
Ickenham	Hillingdon	427.6	0.041	618
South Twickenham	Richmond upon Thames	415.5	0.040	619
Hillside	Merton	362.9	0.040	620
Hayes and Coney Hall	Bromley	645.9	0.040	621
Twickenham Riverside	Richmond upon Thames	416.0	0.038	622
West Wickham	Bromley	582.9	0.038	623
East Sheen	Richmond upon Thames	399.3	0.038	624
Upminster	Havering	486.0	0.037	625
Campden	Kensington and Chelsea	338.7	0.037	626
Dundonald	Merton	350.1	0.037	627
Village	Merton	290.6	0.035	628
Courtfield	Kensington and Chelsea	375.3	0.035	629
St. Margarets and North Twickenham	Richmond upon Thames	406.8	0.035	630
Petts Wood and Knoll	Bromley	465.4	0.034	631
Queen's Gate	Kensington and Chelsea	233.4	0.025	632
Knightsbridge and Belgravia	Westminster	98.5	0.009	633

The *Employment Scale, Score and Rank* measures are calculated as for the Income Scale, Score and Rank but relating to employment deprivation and using the working age rather than total population in its calculation.

Not surprisingly, there is a strong degree of overlap between wards with high levels of employment deprivation and income deprivation. The same two wards that have over 30 per cent of residents in income deprivation have more than 20 per cent of working age residents excluded from the labour market. There are 93 wards in London with less than five per cent of their working age population in employment deprivation.

Table 7 London wards with the highest employment score

Ward Name	Borough	Employment scale number	Employment score	Employment rank
Golborne	Kensington and Chelsea	1204.9	0.219	1
Church Street	Westminster	1570.8	0.209	2
Northumberland Park	Haringey	1892.5	0.195	3
Stonebridge	Brent	1929.6	0.192	4
Notting Dale	Kensington and Chelsea	946.4	0.190	5
Dalgarno	Kensington and Chelsea	759.6	0.186	6
Westbourne	Westminster	1498.1	0.173	7
Harlesden	Brent	1872.0	0.171	8
New Addington North	Croydon	987.4	0.165	9
Queen's Park	Westminster	1385.9	0.164	10
Woodberry Down	Hackney	1024.4	0.161	11
Lansbury	Tower Hamlets	1838.3	0.160	12
White Hart Lane	Haringey	1333.8	0.159	13
Edmonton Green	Enfield	1846.6	0.159	14
Hackney Wick	Hackney	1345.6	0.158	15
Bellingham	Lewisham	1481.0	0.155	16
Wormholt and White City	Hammersmith and Fulham	1268.4	0.151	17
Churchill	Westminster	992.0	0.148	18
New Addington South	Croydon	977.2	0.148	19
Homerton	Hackney	1305.7	0.145	20

Source: GLA calculations from Indices of Deprivation 2019, MHCLG

The IDACI Scale, Score and Rank measures are calculated as for the Income Scale, Score and Rank but relating to children (aged under 16) in income deprivation using the total number of children under 16 rather than the total population.

Wards with the highest proportion of children in income deprivation in London include more wards in some boroughs than are ranked among the highest on other summary measures, for example Islington, but Tower Hamlets, which had high proportions in previous versions of IMD and other child poverty measures does not have any wards in the top 20 on this measure. There are 34 wards in London with 30 per cent of children or more in income deprivation and 22 wards with five per cent of children or less in income deprivation. Westminster and Kensington & Chelsea both include wards that feature at the very top and very bottom on this measure.

Table 8 London wards with the highest and lowest IDACI score

Ward Name	Borough	IDACI count (raw)	IDACI score	IDACI score rank
Golborne	Kensington and Chelsea	546.71	0.361	1
Faraday	Southwark	1018.96	0.338	2
Church Street	Westminster	987.74	0.336	3
Notting Dale	Kensington and Chelsea	581.08	0.335	4
Haggerston	Hackney	852.46	0.334	5
Hackney Wick	Hackney	886.68	0.332	6
Homerton	Hackney	1001.66	0.330	7
Canonbury	Islington	701.92	0.330	8
Coldharbour	Lambeth	1113.68	0.326	9
New Addington North	Croydon	1117.36	0.326	10
Evelyn	Lewisham	1352.76	0.325	11
Hoxton West	Hackney	681.25	0.322	12
Bunhill	Islington	767.86	0.322	13
Caledonian	Islington	725.56	0.321	14
St. Pancras and Somers Town	Camden	1085.13	0.320	15
Westbourne	Westminster	1010.99	0.320	16
Dalgarno	Kensington and Chelsea	455.98	0.319	17
Wormholt and White City	Hammersmith and Fulham	964.85	0.315	18
Tottenham Green	Haringey	984.10	0.312	19
Northumberland Park	Haringey	1254.27	0.311	20
Abingdon	Kensington and Chelsea	64.72	0.045	615
Royal Hospital	Kensington and Chelsea	58.71	0.043	616
West Wickham	Bromley	123.62	0.042	617
Hampstead Town	Camden	99.78	0.042	618
Petts Wood and Knoll	Bromley	107.10	0.042	619
Monkhams	Redbridge	63.28	0.041	620
Northcote	Wandsworth	133.15	0.041	621
Frognal and Fitzjohns	Camden	111.28	0.041	622
Dundonald	Merton	74.62	0.039	623
South Twickenham	Richmond upon Thames	73.94	0.036	624
Twickenham Riverside	Richmond upon Thames	67.87	0.033	625
St. Margarets and North				
Twickenham	Richmond upon Thames	85.56	0.033	626
Village	Merton	47.95	0.031	627
East Sheen	Richmond upon Thames	77.34	0.031	628
Hillside	Merton	41.90	0.028	629
Campden	Kensington and Chelsea	41.37	0.022	630
Queen's Gate	Kensington and Chelsea	27.40	0.019	631
Courtfield	Kensington and Chelsea	27.54	0.017	632
Knightsbridge and Belgravia	Westminster	21.49	0.017	633

The *IDAOPI Scale, Score* and *Rank* measures are calculated as for the Income Scale, Score and Rank but relating to older people (aged 60 and over) in income deprivation using the total number of people aged 60 or over rather than the total population.

Tower Hamlets dominates the list of wards with a high proportion of older people in income deprivation, with all the top ten wards from Tower Hamlets. In eight of these wards, at least half of all people aged over 60 are counted as being in income deprivation. Just three London wards have fewer than one in twenty older people in income deprivation.

Table 9 London wards with the highest and lowest IDAOPI score rank

Mand Name	Danasak	IDAOPI	IDAOPI	IDAOPI
Ward Name	Borough	score (rank)	score	score (rank)
Spitalfields & Banglatown	Tower Hamlets	636.98	0.590	1
Whitechapel	Tower Hamlets	654.36	0.556	2
Poplar	Tower Hamlets	318.94	0.521	3
St. Dunstan's	Tower Hamlets	580.71	0.515	4
Bromley South	Tower Hamlets	393.39	0.508	5
St. Peter's	Tower Hamlets	879.35	0.503	6
Stepney Green	Tower Hamlets	714.48	0.503	7
Bromley North	Tower Hamlets	465.36	0.500	8
Shadwell	Tower Hamlets	665.49	0.496	9
Mile End	Tower Hamlets	696.47	0.484	10
Coldharbour	Lambeth	758.95	0.480	11
Haggerston	Hackney	699.73	0.479	12
Lansbury	Tower Hamlets	835.02	0.466	13
Weavers	Tower Hamlets	619.97	0.464	14
Shacklewell	Hackney	374.58	0.459	15
Church Street	Westminster	976.81	0.455	16
King's Park	Hackney	761.18	0.454	17
White Hart Lane	Haringey	759.86	0.453	18
Woodberry Down	Hackney	522.11	0.448	19
Homerton	Hackney	556.25	0.446	20
Village	Merton	153.89	0.069	614
Biggin Hill	Bromley	175.60	0.069	615
Carshalton South and Clockhouse	Sutton	153.84	0.067	616
Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom	Bromley	252.20	0.066	617
Hacton	Havering	225.30	0.065	618
St. Mary's & St. James	Bexley	178.66	0.065	619
St. Margarets and North Twickenham	Richmond upon Thames	108.96	0.064	620
Cheam	Sutton	182.57	0.064	621
East Sheen	Richmond upon Thames	137.15	0.064	622
Sanderstead	Croydon	273.13	0.063	623
Tudor	Kingston upon Thames	117.67	0.061	624
Cranham	Havering	231.03	0.061	625
Eastcote and East Ruislip	Hillingdon	201.03	0.058	626
West Wickham	Bromley	240.01	0.058	627
Farnborough and Crofton	Bromley	245.29	0.056	628
Ickenham	Hillingdon	147.89	0.053	629
Hayes and Coney Hall	Bromley	208.13	0.051	630
Upminster	Havering	182.38	0.046	631
Petts Wood and Knoll	Bromley	165.04	0.043	632
Knightsbridge and Belgravia Source: GLA calculations from Indices of	Westminster Deprivation 2019, MHCLG	59.05	0.033	633

## **CITY** INTELLIGENCE

Greater London Authority City Hall The Queens Walk London SE1 2AA

Tel 020 7983 4000 Minicom 020 7983 4000 Email Rachel.Leeser@london.gov.uk