



view: shaping the north east

REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR THE NORTH EAST

SUBMISSION DRAFT

**EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC
INFORMATION NOTE 8**

MIGRATION BETWEEN LOCAL AUTHORITIES



**NORTH EAST
ASSEMBLY**
THE VOICE FOR
THE REGION

Migration between local authorities

INTRODUCTION

1. EiP Information Note 3 shows how population has changed between 1991 and 2004 in local authorities throughout the North East. EiP Information Note 2 shows the importance of migration to the region's population. Zero net migration would result in a reduction in the North East's population because there are more deaths than births. This Information Note is primarily concerned with the movement of population between local authorities and trends that surround this migration.

2. Functional urban areas are often covered by more than one local authority. This is the case in both Tyne & Wear and Tees Valley. Settlements or sub-urban areas in neighbouring authorities may form parts of the same housing market. Therefore people's choices in moving house are not restricted to administrative boundaries. This means that there will be a natural ebb and flow of people moving house between local authority areas. The presence of such movements within housing markets and between local authorities is governed by people making choices about where they live. The North East Housing Aspirations Study (2005) reveals the factors which influence people's choices.

3. In the early 1990s the young and economically active people left the North East looking for work as this period coincided with recession and decline of traditional industries. However, there were also more localised migration movements between local authorities within or immediately adjacent to the region. This latter factor is important as Berwick in the north and Tees Valley in the south are very close to region's boundaries and form housing markets with neighbouring authorities outside of the North East.

URBAN FLIGHT

4. Urban flight is a controversial description given to migration trends where people move away from the core of urban areas to suburban areas, neighbouring settlements and more rural areas. This can result in a move from one local authority to another.

5. There are three key issues which require explanation:

- Where is migration happening?
- What is the magnitude or impact of migration?
- Why is this happening?

Where is migration happening?

6. All local authorities lose and gain population through births, deaths and migration in any given year or time period. Local authorities gain and lose people through migration to and from various local authorities not all of which will be immediate neighbours. There are major net urban to urban and net urban to rural flows. The net flows from rural to urban areas are less dominant in comparison.

7. Table 1 below shows the changes in net migration in the North East region from Mid 1998 to Mid 2003. It compares FHSA (Family Health Services Authority) data with net migration from the Office of National Statistics Mid Year Estimates.

EiP INFORMATION NOTE 8: MIGRATION MOVEMENTS

The FHSA data only considers GP registration within England & Wales and not international movements. The Mid Year Estimates include all net migration. FHSA data is also available to measure the movements between origin and destination local authorities. This is discussed in table 3 below.

Table 1: North East Net Migration Comparison 1998-2003

Mid Year	NET MIGRATION	
	ONS Mid Year Estimates	FHSA (Internal Migration)
1998-99	-8,800	-5,310
1999-00	-4,900	-4,500
2000-01	-1,500	-3,700
2001-02	500	-800
2002-03	2,600	1,900

What is the magnitude or impact of migration?

8. Distinguishing between net and gross flows help to show the impact of migration.

9. Table 2 below shows the absolute gross movements of people into and out of the North East's local authorities based on FHSA data. The net movements show the extent to which these gross movements affect each local authority. The largest average net loss of population is from the region's urban areas. Similarly Easington is also notable by its negative net migration.

10. Table 2 also shows that urban authorities in Tyne & Wear and Tees Valley lost and gained on average a larger proportion of their 2003 population than neighbouring authorities in County Durham and Northumberland. However, the crucial issue is not the size or magnitude of the gross flows between local authorities but the overall net impact of these movements.

11. Table 2 shows that the local authorities that make up the Tyne & Wear and Tees Valley conurbations incurred a net loss of migrants over the 1998-2003 period. The exceptions to this were North Tyneside and Stockton. With the exception of Easington, County Durham and Northumberland were net recipients of migrants over the 1998-2003 period.

EiP INFORMATION NOTE 8: MIGRATION MOVEMENTS

**Table 2: - Average Annual Local Authority Migration Movements (1998-2003)
As a Proportion of the Population in 2003 – Source FHSA Data.**

Ave 1998-2003	Gross In	% In	Gross Out	% Out	Net Migration	2003 MYE of Population (ONS)
Tees Valley	19,858	3.0	21,054	3.2	-1,174	652,800
Darlington	3,570	3.6	3,424	3.5	166	98,200
Hartlepool	2,052	2.3	1,984	2.2	66	90,200
Middlesbrough	4,632	3.3	6,268	4.5	-1,654	139,000
Redcar and Cleveland	3,778	2.7	4,176	3.0	-418	139,100
Stockton-on-Tees	5,826	3.1	5,202	2.8	666	186,300
County Durham	20,508	4.1	19,802	4.0	788	494,200
Chester-le-Street	2,294	4.3	2,262	4.2	32	53,300
Derwentside	2,950	3.4	2,558	3.0	412	85,600
Durham	6,372	7.1	5,976	6.7	394	89,200
Easington	2,000	2.2	2,412	2.6	-370	92,800
Sedgefield	3,192	3.7	3,132	3.6	82	87,300
Teesdale	1,358	5.5	1,142	4.6	216	24,700
Wear Valley	2,342	3.8	2,320	3.8	22	61,300
Northumberland	13,588	4.4	12,208	3.9	1,278	309,200
Alnwick	1,714	5.4	1,408	4.5	286	31,500
Berwick-upon-Tweed	1,280	4.9	1,144	4.4	136	26,000
Blyth Valley	3,042	3.7	2,854	3.5	188	81,500
Castle Morpeth	2,774	5.6	2,558	5.2	176	49,500
Tynedale	2,736	4.6	2,280	3.8	436	59,400
Wansbeck	2,042	3.3	1,964	3.2	56	61,300
Tyne & Wear	36,718	3.4	40,112	3.7	-3,396	1,083,200
Gateshead	6,070	3.2	6,526	3.4	-476	191,000
Newcastle upon Tyne	14,280	5.4	16,044	6.0	-1,746	266,600
North Tyneside	7,362	3.9	6,724	3.5	638	190,800
South Tyneside	3,070	2.0	3,544	2.3	-454	151,700
Sunderland	5,936	2.1	7,274	2.6	-1,358	283,100
NORTH EAST	40,086	1.6	42,568	1.7	-2,482	2,539,400

12. The information in Table 3 below shows average annual net migration movements between North East sub-regions and other English regions based on FHSA data (1998-2003). This data also measures movements within England and Wales only. It shows that the Tyne & Wear authorities have had a net loss of people into neighbouring authorities in County Durham and Northumberland and into other parts of England & Wales. Nearly 90% of the migrants gained by Northumberland originate in Tyne & Wear. Over the same time period County Durham was a net recipient of population with the largest share of in-migrants originating in Tyne & Wear.

13. Tees Valley was a net recipient of population from within the North East, the largest contribution being from County Durham. However, the southern hinterland of Tees Valley is North Yorkshire. The largest loss of population from Tees Valley was into Yorkshire & the Humber. There were also significant annual net losses to the North West.

EiP INFORMATION NOTE 8: MIGRATION MOVEMENTS

14. Although there are a number of significant movements between local authorities the impact at sub-regional level has been a net loss in urban areas and a net gain in rural areas.

15. More detailed analysis in Annex A shows the net annual local authority to local authority movements for the same time period.

Please note that Annex A replaces Annex B in RSS Technical Paper 4 and that the following table replaces Table 4 in RSS Technical Paper 4.

Table 3: Average Annual Net Migration (1998-2003) – Source FHSA data

From \ To	Tees Valley	County Durham	Northumberland	Tyne & Wear	NORTH EAST
Tees Valley		-188	10	8	-170
County Durham	188		4	-844	-652
Northumberland	-10	-4		-1,270	-1,284
Tyne & Wear	-8	844	1,270		2,106
NORTH EAST	170	652	1,284	-2,106	
ENG & WALES (LESS NE)	-1,340	172	154	-1,398	-2,412
North West	-264	12	-110	-50	-412
Yorkshire & Humber	-754	-68	-62	-150	-1,034
East Midlands	-204	22	-38	-164	-384
West Midlands	-80	118	30	-120	-52
East of England	-38	74	16	-88	-36
London	74	-212	132	-480	-486
South East	-46	166	152	-176	96
South West	-20	58	36	-168	-94
Wales	-8	2	-2	-2	-10
ENG, WALES & NORTH EAST	-1,170	824	1,438	-3,504	-2,412

Why is this happening?

16. The North East Housing Aspirations Study (2005) concludes that people's choices about where to live are based on personal criteria that meet needs and aspirations within financial capacity. The study points to a number of features of property and living environment that people aspire to dependent on their income. Migration movements would suggest that these aspirations are better met in areas with positive net migration. In urban local authorities this has been observed where there has been a higher than average build rate, such as in Stockton and North Tyneside. People's propensity to move is therefore motivated by their financial capacity to access their needs and aspirations. The present migration represents the spatial interpretation of this.

17. The findings suggest a greater motivation than purely a natural ebb and flow of population. This is further reinforced by the significant degree of dissatisfaction in the Pathfinder area with the living environment on offer. Generally there was an aspiration across the region towards 'suburban'-style living.

18. The Aspirations Study also concludes that some local authorities have been building higher than the regional average of net additions. These include Stockton, Darlington, Hartlepool, North Tyneside, Alnwick and Castle Morpeth. These have been building more semi-detached and detached housing. The lowest build rates

EiP INFORMATION NOTE 8: MIGRATION MOVEMENTS

were observed in South Tyneside, Newcastle, Middlesbrough, Redcar & Cleveland and Easington. This correlates with the migration movements in Table 1 showing that there has been positive net migration in areas with high build rates.

19. Those local authorities who have benefited from positive net migration have been those that have diversified their dwelling stock to a greater extent and have therefore been better meeting aspirations than other local authorities. Similarly they have created the space and capacity for people to migrate to their areas. The migration movements demonstrate people's choice within the housing market.

CONCLUSION

20. The region experiences significant internal migration that is motivated to a large extent by people's financial capacity to meet their aspirations and the physical presence of locations where this can occur. There are some significant movements between urban areas and some significant movements from urban to rural areas. Table 4 shows that there is a dominant flow away from the predominantly urban areas to the predominantly rural areas. This flow is not consistent with the objectives of delivering sustainable communities and concentrating development within defined settlements in the city regions as advocated by the Submission Draft RSS.

21. The net impact of migration is important as it is this which is one of the determinants of population change and requirements for additional dwellings. The provision of dwellings that meet aspirations in sustainable locations should provide the motivation to retain and attract population to urban areas as advocated by the Submission Draft RSS.

EiP INFORMATION NOTE 8: MIGRATION MOVEMENTS

Annex A – Average Annual Net Migration (1998-2003) Between North East Local Authorities, England and Wales

From	To	Darlington	Hartlepool	Middlesbrough	Redcar & C'land	Stockton	Tees Valley	Chester-le-Street	Derwent side	Durham City	Easington	Sedgefield	Teesdale	Wear Valley	Co Durham
Darlington		0	12	-42	-30	-76	-136	60	-12	-10	-10	-58	-26	-52	-108
Hartlepool		-12	0	18	-4	6	8	-6	-2	8	-86	-12	0	4	-94
Middlesbrough		42	-18	0	136	668	828	0	0	10	2	20	2	-6	28
Redcar & C'land		30	4	-136	0	180	78	-2	2	8	-4	10	10	-2	22
Stockton		76	-6	-668	-180	0	-778	-4	-8	8	-12	-26	8	-2	-36
Tees Valley		136	-8	-828	-78	778	0	48	-20	24	-110	-66	-6	-58	-188
Chester-le-Street		-60	6	0	2	4	-48	0	54	52	-18	34	0	14	136
Derwentside		12	2	0	-2	8	20	-54	0	-14	-6	26	-2	20	-30
Durham		10	-8	-10	-8	-8	-24	-52	14	0	-62	82	14	64	60
Easington		10	86	-2	4	12	110	18	6	62	0	48	6	16	156
Sedgefield		58	12	-20	-10	26	66	-34	-26	-82	-48	0	14	-16	-192
Teesdale		26	0	-2	-10	-8	6	0	2	-14	-6	-14	0	-84	-116
Wear Valley		52	-4	6	2	2	58	-14	-20	-64	-16	16	84	0	-14
Co Durham		108	94	-28	-22	36	188	-136	30	-60	-156	192	116	14	0
Alnwick		-2	2	-2	2	-2	-2	-4	-2	-4	-2	4	2	0	-6
Berwick		0	0	0	0	-2	-2	-4	-8	4	8	2	0	2	4
Blyth Valley		-4	-2	0	-8	4	-10	2	6	0	4	0	2	0	14
Castle Morpeth		6	0	0	-2	0	4	-8	4	-2	-6	-8	0	2	-18
Tynedale		-2	-6	0	0	-2	-10	-8	-20	8	-4	-2	4	6	-16
Wansbeck		4	0	2	0	4	10	6	6	-2	4	0	0	4	18
Northumberland		2	-6	0	-8	2	-10	-16	-14	4	4	-4	8	14	-4
Gateshead		8	8	-8	-4	10	14	66	254	10	4	2	2	18	356
Newcastle		-8	-10	-28	-32	-36	-114	8	60	-60	-10	0	-4	-6	-12
North Tyneside		10	-2	2	0	-4	6	4	18	8	-6	-8	-4	0	12
South Tyneside		10	-2	8	0	4	20	22	42	30	8	10	8	10	130
Sunderland		22	8	8	-4	32	66	100	54	148	-24	24	16	40	358
Tyne & Wear		42	2	-18	-40	6	-8	200	428	136	-28	28	18	62	844
North East		288	82	-874	-148	822	170	96	424	104	-290	150	136	32	652
Rest Eng & Wales		-90	-2	-880	-196	-172	-1,340	-2,590	-5,178	284	-14	-80	90	-28	172
North West		-46	-40	-80	-64	-34	-264	-28	-12	126	-22	-38	90	-18	12
Yorks & Humber		-8	-10	-372	-218	-146	-754	-36	-60	90	-40	-30	4	-20	-68

EiP INFORMATION NOTE 8: MIGRATION MOVEMENTS

Annex A – Average Annual Net Migration (1998-2003) Between North East Local Authorities, England and Wales - Continued

From	To	Alnwick	Berwick	Blyth Valley	Castle Morpeth	Tynedale	Wansbeck	Northumberland	Gateshead	Newcastle	North Tyneside	South Tyneside	Sunderland	Tyne & Wear
Darlington		2	0	4	-6	2	-4	-2	-8	8	-10	-10	-22	-42
Hartlepool		-2	0	2	0	6	0	6	-8	10	2	2	-8	-2
Middlesbrough		2	0	0	0	0	-2	0	8	28	-2	-8	-8	18
Redcar & C'land		-2	0	8	2	0	0	8	4	32	0	0	4	40
Stockton		2	2	-4	0	2	-4	-2	-10	36	4	-4	-32	-6
Tees Valley		2	2	10	-4	10	-10	10	-14	114	-6	-20	-66	8
Chester-le-Street		4	4	-2	8	8	-6	16	-66	-8	-4	-22	-100	-200
Derwentside		2	8	-6	-4	20	-6	14	-254	-60	-18	-42	-54	-428
Durham		4	-4	0	2	-8	2	-4	-10	60	-8	-30	-148	-136
Easington		2	-8	-4	6	4	-4	-4	-4	10	6	-8	24	28
Sedgefield		-4	-2	0	8	2	0	4	-2	0	8	-10	-24	-28
Teesdale		-2	0	-2	0	-4	0	-8	-2	4	4	-8	-16	-18
Wear Valley		0	-2	0	-2	-6	-4	-14	-18	6	0	-10	-40	-62
Co Durham		6	-4	-14	18	16	-18	4	-356	12	-12	-130	-358	-844
Alnwick		0	2	-30	-46	-12	2	-84	-26	-34	-44	-10	-6	-120
Berwick		-2	0	-8	4	0	0	-6	-2	18	-2	-8	-4	2
Blyth Valley		30	8	0	24	28	30	120	-30	-160	-138	-8	-18	-354
Castle Morpeth		46	-4	-24	0	42	46	106	-36	-206	-58	-12	-12	-324
Tynedale		12	0	-28	-42	0	-2	-60	-136	-148	-70	-24	-32	-410
Wansbeck		-2	0	-30	-46	2	0	-76	-14	-24	-12	-10	-4	-64
Northumberland		84	6	-120	-106	60	76	0	-244	-554	-324	-72	-76	-1,270
Gateshead		26	2	30	36	136	14	244	0	-370	86	12	2	-270
Newcastle		34	-18	160	206	148	24	554	370	0	1,122	-46	-136	1,310
North Tyneside		44	2	138	58	70	12	324	-86	-1,122	0	-52	-26	-1,286
South Tyneside		10	8	8	12	24	10	72	-12	46	52	0	14	100
Sunderland		6	4	18	12	32	4	76	-2	136	26	-14	0	146
Tyne & Wear		120	-2	354	324	410	64	1,270	270	-1,310	1,286	-100	-146	0
North East		212	2	230	232	496	112	1,284	-344	-1,738	944	-322	-646	-2,106
Rest Eng & Wales		86	106	-28	24	28	-62	154	-138	-256	-212	-130	-662	-1,398
North West		6	-4	-50	-8	-26	-28	-110	-58	186	-48	-24	-106	-50
Yorks & Humber		12	26	-30	-30	-20	-20	-62	-30	232	-86	-78	-188	-150