

Population Churn

The initial scoping paper for Scrutiny Sub-Committee C's Population and Migration review suggested the following questions should be considered by the committee:

- 1) What are the facts of Southwark's population churn and how does that compare with other authorities?
- 2) What do we know about the impact of that churn?
- 3) What should we do next to add to our understanding of churn and manage the impact it has?

This paper summarises existing knowledge in response to these questions and suggests some possible next steps for the Council to take.

This information has been gathered together by the Corporate Policy team and represents the existing level of understanding, rather than a fully comprehensive record of all the Council's work on this subject. Work is ongoing to build a better shared understanding across the Council of the impacts of population churn.

1. The facts of Southwark's population churn

- 1.1 Given its position as a global economic centre, London has long been a powerful magnet for people from across the UK and the world, giving it a vibrant, diverse and constantly changing population. This movement of people has strengthened London's standing as a global city and brought significant economic and social benefits.
- 1.2 Over the past decade, there has been an increase in international migration and there is now an estimated net increase in the overseas born population of London of about 100,000 per year. However, the turnover of people moving in and out of the city (excluding within London) is estimated at almost 250,000 per annum.
- 1.3 There is also a substantial amount of movement within London, encouraged by London's active housing market, the large numbers of the population with no settled homes and the scale of the private rented sector. At least three kinds of mobility can be observed in London – to and from overseas; to and from the rest of the UK; and within London itself. London's position as the nation's capital and financial centre means that much of the inward migration into London is from elsewhere in the UK and not solely from overseas.
- 1.4 Research by the London School of Economics (LSE) has found some that some London boroughs have levels of population mobility greater than 35% per annum of the population¹. The LSE's report also suggested that those arriving in London often do so with significant needs for public service support (e.g. with language skills and housing), but that once they have received support, they are likely to move on to other parts of London or the UK and be replaced with new arrivals requiring similar support.

¹ Population Mobility and Service Provision: A report for London Councils, LSE, 2007

- 1.5 Southwark's population continues to grow at a faster rate than the national average, and both the Office for National Statistics (ONS) and the Greater London Authority (GLA) predict that Southwark's population will continue to grow over the next two decades. Recent years have seen an increase in diversity as well as in absolute numbers, with new communities not only from the A10² accession countries in the EU, but also from Sierra Leone, Franco-phone Africa and Latin America.
- 1.6 Southwark has always been a borough with high in and out migration, as well as people moving within the borough. For example, at the time of the 2001 Census, about 30,000 people had lived elsewhere in the previous twelve months, while some schools report that up to 30% of pupils taking Key Stage 2 tests joined the school other than in reception year.
- 1.7 This rapid transformation of our community profile presents public services with additional costs. The LSE estimated that London Councils in aggregate are spending in excess of £100 million a year in dealing with the pressures resulting from high population mobility.³
- 1.8 However, while population mobility is recognised as a significant issue for Southwark, and London as a whole, much of the recent attention in this policy area has been focused on absolute population numbers in areas in order to influence funding allocation from government. Further work is also needed to better understand the impacts and costs of population mobility on public service delivery, as well as the impact it can have on community cohesion.
- 1.9 Officers have been supporting a pan-London project led by the London Collaborative (a collaboration between Capital Ambition and London Boroughs) to build a greater understanding of population flows across London. This work has so far provided information about the intelligence held by other local authorities in London and Southwark Council will continue to contribute to this work as it develops.

2. The impact of churn

- 2.1 The arrival of new communities into Southwark does have a recognised and significant impact on the services the Council delivers, although further work is needed to fully understand and quantify this. The Council has relied on existing budgets to manage these pressures and meet the needs of local communities and maintain community cohesion, but improved understanding would allow more to be done to predict and mitigate against likely future impacts.
- 2.2. Southwark Council has recently submitted a bid to the Migration Impacts Fund, a two-year fund created by the Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) to assist local areas in dealing with the short-term funding pressures that migration can have on local public services. The projects that were submitted to this bid provide a useful snapshot of some of the key impacts that churn has on Southwark. Some of the main policy issues to

² A10 refers to the ten Accession states which have joined the EU since 2004 (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia)

³ Population Mobility and Service Provision: A report for London Councils, LSE, 2007

emerge from this process are summarised in the table below, although these are just some of the impacts emerging from an issue which has a much broader impact.

Service	Impact
Housing	<p>Many people choose to live in private rented housing when they first arrive in Southwark. Private rented housing makes up 27% of the housing tenure in Southwark, and has grown from 14.8% in 2001. A significant percentage of the private rented housing market is Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs), which are often the only option for migrant workers. HMOs used to be the domain of the single person yet we are now finding these properties occupied by families who, because of their migrant status, find themselves at the bottom of the housing market. The crowding that can take place in such dwellings is detrimental to the health of adults and children. These houses are poorly insulated, draughty, with heating systems that are inefficient leading to health problems from excessive cold and associated dampness, and the inability to afford the heating for their accommodation. In many cases safety requirements are not fully adhered to, including basic fire safety regulations. As a result the risk of accidents is increased. The severe restriction on space and poor standards of health impact on children and child development. Migrant workers are thought to occupy a significant percentage of HMOs in Southwark, with the most common issues being around fire safety, inadequate provision of kitchens and bathrooms, and overcrowding.</p>
Education	<p>Schools in Southwark serve very diverse local communities. More than 70% of pupils in Southwark are from black and minority ethnic communities, while over 40% of pupils in Southwark do not speak English with their parents at home.</p> <p>Pupils who spend less than the expected time in a key stage tend to attain lower results in SATs (particularly if they have had limited previous educational experience or have to acquire English as an additional language) contributing to lower overall results. For some schools, the total number of mobile pupils on roll identified in the school census does not give an accurate representation of the comparative turbulence of joiners and leavers that they manage, which may adversely affect future funding allocations. Schools also have to respond to the impact of dislocation and loss on pupils' progress and accompanying issues such as family separation, homelessness and social deprivation.</p> <p>At secondary school level, there are some links between children who newly arrived in the UK and higher levels of truancy due to disengagement with education, which then puts them at risk of becoming NEET (Not in Education, Employment or Training) at age 16. West African children and girls from a Muslim background have been identified as being particularly vulnerable in this regard.</p>
Health	<p>When people arrive in a new area they do not always immediately register with their local GP, with research in London showing that nearly 40% of people took longer than 6 months to re-register with a</p>

	<p>GP after a change of address, and 13% more than a year. This delay in people registering with their GP has a significant impact around screening and immunisation programmes and the ability of health professionals to engage the public in health promotion campaigns. More mobile populations make undertaking preventative care much more difficult as by its nature this requires a stable local population and a reliable way of contacting people who may need preventative support. GP registrations are also used as one means of measuring population movement within the UK, and yet are not always accurate if people do not choose to re-register immediately after moving.</p> <p>Access to health services, particularly primary care, is a significant issue in relation to migrant communities. People who are new to the borough and who may not understand how to navigate the health system often attend Accident and Emergency wards even with only minor health complaints as they are not aware of primary care services. This increases demand for emergency health care and has an effect on all users of health services. For example, an analysis of local A&E attendees in 2006 showed that West African families with children under 5, Polish people under the age of 30 and members of the Latin American community were attending A&E for predominantly primary care needs across Southwark and Lambeth. An analysis of A&E attendances over a three month period in 2007/08 by North Southwark GP practices found that 44% of these attendances could have been seen within a primary care setting both out of hours and also within hours.</p>
Rough Sleeping	<p>Since the accession of the A10⁴ countries to the EU in 2004, a large number of economic migrants from these countries have entered the UK to seek work. A particular issue for Southwark is the number of A10 migrants who are resorting to rough sleeping or are at risk of rough sleeping (e.g. those that are squatting), which is growing issue during the economic downturn. As at Southwark's official rough sleeper count on 2 April 2009 there were 15 rough sleepers, of whom 6 were A10 nationals (and a further 2 eastern Europeans). However, this figure is only a snapshot and there are known to be significantly higher numbers A10s sleeping rough or at risk of doing so in Southwark. Of particular concern is the fact that there are significant issues with crime and anti-social behaviour associated with a small but significant number of this group. This is a particular issue in the north of the borough where there are a number of homelessness centres which can attract rough sleepers to the surrounding area as a result.</p>

2.3 The Revenue Support Grant (RSG) formula does not measure population mobility or transience, although it does measure sparsity of population to support local authorities with the costs of servicing sparsely populated areas. Furthermore, the centralised nature of the local government funding system means that local authorities are unlikely to benefit from any growth in their tax base as a result of increased population or economic activity resulting from mobility or migration.

⁴ A10 refers to the ten Accession states which have joined the EU since 2004 (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia)

3. Next steps

- 3.1 Understanding Southwark's population both in quantitative and more qualitative respects is of great importance, not only in securing more sufficient funding allocations from Government, but also in ensuring that we design and deliver appropriate services to our communities.
- 3.2 A number of assumptions about churn remain untested and need further consideration. For example, the impact of regeneration on the level of churn could be explored, or the impact that it has on educational attainment or health outcomes might need further examination. More generally, evidence-based policy making and service design and commissioning will benefit from a more nuanced and comprehensive understanding of Southwark's population and its movements.
- 3.3 Following the preliminary research underpinning this paper, officers have identified a number of potential workstreams to improve understanding of the extent of population churn within the borough, the impacts of that churn, and developing a strategy and action plan in response. These are as follows:
 - 1) Commission a research project to gather the best available intelligence about shifting patterns of migration and movement within Southwark, bringing together existing knowledge within the Council and drawing on external support where required.
 - 2) Given the impact that churn has across a range of public services in Southwark, lead a discussion with the Southwark Alliance to build cross-partner awareness of population churn and consider a coordinated and jointly-resourced response.
 - 3) Work closely with other local authorities in London to better understand the movement of people in and around London and explore opportunities for sharing information and resources on this issue.

Dan Gilby

**Corporate Policy Officer
Southwark Council**