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INTRODUCTION

The targets and measurements of *Barking and Dagenham Together* (Borough Manifesto) represent a tool to assess the progress made towards achieving our aspirations. Consequently, they must be the foundations of our plans, policies and collaborative strategies. The present document aims to provides relevant stakeholders with further details about each measurement selected.

Three broad initial criteria have been favoured when performing the challenging task of choosing the indicators that will allow us to monitor progress towards the achievement of the Barking and Dagenham vision. The first rule to pick our measurements was selecting, where possible, those indicators available for the different London Boroughs, with the aim of comparing our performance with other places in London. Second, we attempted to collect indicators from data regularly updated (e.g. yearly) with the purpose of continuously tracking our performance. Third, we only considered robust and reliable data sources (e.g. Office of National Statistics).

Numerous targets and measurements could have been considered to monitor our progress. Nonetheless, we aimed to choose a reduced number of targets and measurements likely to have a significant impact on our aspirations. In other words, instead of monitoring every single possible measurement available, we were interested in targeting the ones that if we were to achieve, they would largely address the spectrum of long-term challenges we currently face.

On defining the general targets, we have attempted to set goals that are ambitious but at the same time achievable. In this regard, we have analysed the trends of the various indicators over the years in the different London Boroughs and nationally, with the purpose of identifying the magnitude of the changes required in Barking and Dagenham to catch up with the rest of London. By understanding the precedents, the current conditions and the ambitious plans that will take place in Barking and Dagenham during the coming years, we have set specific targets and benchmarks (e.g. East London Average, London Average) that seem reasonably achievable. In this report, we present a detailed review of only one specific key measurement for each of the 13 targets. For the rest of the measurements only a brief description is provided. This is because the current report intends to provide a summary of the rationale underlying the targets and measurements, instead of a thorough analysis. However, further details can be provided to relevant stakeholders upon request to the Corporate Insight Hub.

With the intention of presenting the targets and measurements in a more intuitive way, we have grouped them into broad categories (e.g. Safety, Skills and Education). Nonetheless, the targets and measurements chosen are expected to have a cross-cutting impact on different aspirations, considering that public services and socio-economic outcomes are deeply interconnected. Therefore, such arrangement must be interpreted as a tool to provide the information in a clearer way to the reader and not as a rigid categorization.

The availability of new data sources or unexpected changes in circumstances may require us to amend our measurements and targets to reflect changes over time. However, the aspiration behind each target will remain unchanged.
The following chart is a summary of the targets and measurements that we will use to track our achievements. Each of them will be explained in more detail in the present report.
We visualise a Borough where people can enjoy economic well-being and can afford to cover their material needs. To make that possible, we need to encourage the creation of prosperous and sustainable businesses able to provide competitive salaries to our residents. For that reason, we have set the three following targets:

- Unemployment rate lower than the East London average.
- Growth in businesses larger than the East London average.
- Median income improving faster than the London average.

1- UNEMPLOYMENT LOWER THAN THE EAST LONDON AVERAGE

**Key measurement described:** Unemployment rate.

**Current Trends:**

- Current unemployment rate is 6.9% (London= 5.7%).
- LBBD seems to be reducing unemployment at a faster rate than London.
- Historic data suggests that LBBD’s employment levels are highly sensitive to changes in the economy. That is, when the unemployment rate for London increases, LBBD shows a significantly higher increase, but when London reduces its unemployment rate, the reduction in LBBD has tended to be significantly larger.
- A potential explanation is that the predominant jobs and skills in LBBD are more sensitive to economic cycles.

![Unemployment rate](image)
Target Rationale:

- Population is expected to increase about 20-25% because of regeneration projects. Such change may bring people less likely to be unemployed. For instance, if the unemployment rate of people moving to the borough is half the rate of current inhabitants in LBBD, the overall rate would decrease almost a percentage point.
- The gap in unemployment rate compared to London is very large (more than 20%).
- Even though the gap in unemployment compared to London is very large, there are good reasons to think that such a gap can be significantly reduced (e.g. regeneration projects, improvements in educational attainment, population changes). However, other parts of London will also take steps to reduce unemployment, and it seems unrealistic to assume that every single year LBBD would be able to outperform London with our unemployment rate decreasing 3 times faster than London (we are not aware of any precedents of that in the UK).
- An East London benchmark seems more achievable in terms of the population characteristics, and it is still an aspirational goal.

Full list of measurements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Definition and Comments</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate.</td>
<td>People without a job who have been actively seeking work in the past 4 weeks and are available to start work in the next 2 weeks. At a borough level, unemployment is obtained by model-based estimates (projections instead of actual counts). Therefore, it is less robust than other indicators.</td>
<td>ONS - Annual population survey (Labour Force).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment rate.</td>
<td>Number of people in employment as a proportion of the population. It complements the unemployment rate, by capturing a different dimension and it represents a more reliable indicator at a Borough level, because it is not model-based.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People claiming Job Seekers Allowance (JSA).</td>
<td>Number of people receiving financial support for being unemployed and actively seeking work. This indicator, is highly correlated to the unemployment rate. However, it tends to be lower than the amount of people not working because not everyone is eligible to receive it. For that reason, by comparing JSA claimants with the number of unemployed people we can have an idea of the number of individuals not working who are receiving no financial support.</td>
<td>Department of Work and Pensions (DWP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People claiming Employment and Support Allowance (ESA).</td>
<td>It captures individuals receiving financial support when having difficulties finding a job because of a long-term illness or disability. This indicator can account for the extent to which the most vulnerable are benefitting from economic prosperity and getting the support to achieve their job goals and improving their skills despite their disability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. GROWTH IN BUSINESSES LARGER THAN THE EAST LONDON AVERAGE.

Key measurement described: 5-years business survival rate.

Current Trends:

- LBBD is creating new businesses at a rate substantially faster than both East London and London in general. However, those new businesses tend to be less successful in the long term.
- The business survival rate after 5 years is 36.2% (London= 39.3%)
- An average annual increase of 0.3 percent faster than East London would be needed to catch up with the region in terms of the 5-years business survival rate.

![Figure 2: 5-years businesses survival rate.](image)

Target Rationale:

- The five-year survival rate seems to be the best available indicator of business creation and sustainability.
- Measuring just the creation of new businesses does not reflect the level of success of those enterprises.
- Business rates was initially suggested as a measure. However, the indicator is related to the value of the business property which is likely to be lower in LBBD. Using this measurement would lead to unfair comparisons.
- East London has been selected as the comparator because it seems to be more similar to Barking and Dagenham in terms of business characteristics.
Full list of measurements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Definition and Comments</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-years business survival rate.</td>
<td>A business is deemed to have survived if having been a birth in year t or having survived to year t; it is active in terms of employment and/or turnover in any part of t+1.</td>
<td>ONS – Nomis. (Inter-Departmental Business Register).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs density.</td>
<td>The level of jobs per resident aged 16-64. For example, a job density of 1.0 would mean that there is one job for every resident aged 16-64. The total number of jobs is a workplace-based measure and comprises employee jobs, self-employed, government-supported trainees and HM Forces. This indicator captures not only the creation of new and sustainable businesses, but also whether businesses are creating enough jobs for our residents.</td>
<td>ONS- Nomis. (Business Register and Employment Survey, Annual Population Survey, DfES, DWP and MoD).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs growth.</td>
<td>The change in the total amount of jobs (% growth/decline) compared to the previous year. It captures not only the amount of jobs available for our residents, but also whether the trends on job creation are improving over time or not.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key measurement described: Gross median annual earnings.

Current Trends:

- People in LBBD have an annual median income of £23,508 (London=£28,927). The income gap is very significant not only with London (18%), but also East London (12%).
- Average income has not increased (but slightly decreased) in the last few years.
- Drastic improvements in income are difficult to achieve (and predict) because it depends on multiple variables (e.g. education levels, economic growth, productivity, inflation).

![Figure 3: Median annual earnings.](image)

Target Rationale:

- Aiming to achieve London income levels seems unrealistic, because the rate of growth needed has no precedent in the UK. LBBD will need to improve their annual income twice as fast as the rest of London every year to be able to catch up in 20 years. Current levels of skills, productivity, among other factors make this goal extremely challenging to achieve.
- On the other hand, expected changes in population because of planned regeneration (e.g. Barking Riverside) are likely to improve median income, because new residents may earn higher salaries.
- Improving income faster than London and reducing the gap as fast as possible seems a more realistic target. London already has one of the highest median income in the UK, but it may keep growing at a slower rate because further earnings improvements tend to be more difficult to achieve once higher levels are reached (diminishing marginal earnings). For that reason, London represents a better benchmark than, for instance, the East London annual median income.
- “Median income” (value dividing earnings distribution into two halves) is a better indicator than the “average income”, because earnings represent a variable with a distribution highly skewed. In other words, if there is a minority group of individuals with extremely high earnings that would artificially inflate the average value of the rest of the population.
Full list of measurements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Definition and Comments</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross median annual earnings.</td>
<td>The indicator shows the median earnings in British Pounds for employees who are on adult rates of pay and whose pay was not affected by absence. The data does not cover those who are self-employed and relates to gross pay before tax, national insurance or other deductions, and excludes payments in kind. Gross Income has been preferred as a measure (compared to other earnings measurements) because the ONS suggests that bonuses and incentive payments that relates to a reference period may be inaccurate. This is because the information is not available to respondents at the time when they are contacted. In addition, Gross Income is a more accurate source than others measuring income because it relies on data provided by employers rather than being self-reported by employees.</td>
<td>ONS – Annual survey of hours and earnings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAFETY

It is every person’s right to feel safe in their community. A perception of safety is a basic requirement for creating civic pride in the area and community cohesion. The following targets have been established to achieve our aspiration:

- Antisocial behaviour lower than Outer London.
- Domestic violence lower than East London.

4- ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR LOWER THAN THE OUTER LONDON AVERAGE.

Key measurement described: Police recorded number of incidents of anti-social behaviour as a rate per 1,000 residents.

Current Trends:

- Current ASB rate is 27.4 per 1,000 residents (Outer London= 23.9).
- LBBD’s ASB rate is reducing at an average rate of 4.1% per year.
- During 2016/17 the rate of ASB increased by 8% in LBBD and 9% in outer London. This is following a 50% reduction over the previous five years.
- Forecasting predicts that the rise seen in 2016/17 will continue into 2017/18 however this is expected to be a much smaller increase.
- ASB levels fluctuate each year, therefore the aim is to achieve an average yearly decrease of 1 percentage point more than Outer London in order to close the gap with Outer London.

Figure 4: Antisocial behaviour rate per 1,000 residents.
Target Rationale:

- Antisocial behaviour was a recurrent theme in our public consultation when people gave feedback about safety in the borough. For that reason, it was critical to consider a measurement that addresses this concern.
- Due to elevated levels of anti-social behaviour (ASB) in Westminster and Tower Hamlets, the current rate of ASB in Barking and Dagenham is lower than that of East London and Inner London.
- The most appropriate and ambitious benchmark for Barking and Dagenham to compare with is therefore Outer London.

Full list of measurements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Definition and Comments</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police recorded number of incidents of anti-social behaviour.</td>
<td>This indicator covers a wide range of unacceptable activities that cause harm to an individual, to their community or to their environment. This could be an action by someone else that leaves you feeling alarmed, harassed or distressed. Examples include: rowdy or inconsiderate neighbours, vandalism, graffiti, fly-posting, street drinking, among many others.</td>
<td>Police recording (data.police.uk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council recorded number of incidents of anti-social behaviour.</td>
<td>Many incidents of Anti-social behaviour may not be serious enough to be escalated to the Police. Instead, they are directly recorded and managed by the Council’s ASB team. Consequently, we also found it crucial to monitor our ASB internal measurements.</td>
<td>Internal data from ASB Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived safety measured by Residents Survey.</td>
<td>Crime in general has consistently decreased in the last few years in the Borough. However, perceptions of safety have not improved in the same way. For this reason, it is important to monitor not only the extent to which crime has reduced, but also how residents are subjectively perceiving improvements.</td>
<td>Residents Survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate Crime reported to police.</td>
<td>LBBD has experienced rapid demographic changes, and it has quickly become a culturally diverse community. We need to make sure that we create civic pride and community cohesion despite our differences. In this regard, tolerance and respect are key elements for our communities, and Hate Crime represents the best available data to monitor this.</td>
<td>Hate Crime Dashboard (Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime-MOPAC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5- DOMESTIC VIOLENCE LOWER THAN THE EAST LONDON AVERAGE.

Key measurement described: Police recorded number of incidents of domestic violence and abuse per 1,000 residents.

Current Trends:

- Barking and Dagenham currently has the highest rate of DVA in London. The 2015/16 DVA rate per 1,000 residents in Barking and Dagenham was 26.7. This compares to the London rate of 16.6 and the East London rate of 18.6.
- The aim is to have an average annual reduction of 1.8 percental points greater than the East London rate reduction in order to be able to catch up with this area.
Target Rationale:

- Barking and Dagenham is more similar to East London in term of population characteristics, and therefore East London has been chosen as the comparator area.
- Over the last five years police reported DVA has increased across London and can be seen in every London borough.
- This may be due to improved recording, reporting and awareness of DVA, instead of a direct demonstration of increases in DVA occurrences.
- The target established is based on the best information available, but the measurement needs to be considered with caution, because the complex nature of the issue makes it difficult to accurately monitor the incidents occurring.

Full list of measurements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Definition and Comments</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence and abuse incidents per 1,000 residents.</td>
<td>The indicator includes any incident or pattern of incidents of controlling, coercive, threatening behaviour, violence or abuse between those aged 16 or over who are, or have been, intimate partners or family members regardless of gender or sexuality.</td>
<td>London Crime Dashboard (Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime-MOPAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of offences in previous 12 months per victim.</td>
<td>We are not only interested in tracking the number of DV incidents but also to capture the extent to which such situations are not persisting in the future. In this regard, the average number of previous incidents reported by victims represents a useful indicator publicly available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SKILLS AND EDUCATION

The skills people need to be able to benefit from economic growth are changing quickly, and it is crucial for our residents to obtain the necessary educational levels and skills required to ensure they can compete and are not being left behind. Therefore, we have established the following target:

✓ Educational attainment at all levels better than the London average.

6. EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT AT ALL LEVELS BETTER THAN THE LONDON AVERAGE.

Key measurement described: Proportion of people with level 1 and above.

Current Trends:

- Current attainment level is 75.9% (London= 84.1%).
- LBBD has recently improved attainment at a faster rate than London.
- LBBD needs an average annual increase 1.7 times faster than London to be able to catch up.

![Figure 6: Educational attainment Level 1 and above.](image)

Target Rationale:

- LBBD has been improving consistently faster in terms of educational attainment relative to London and the rest of the UK. The target seems achievable if rates of improvement are sustained in the long term.
- London is the place with the highest levels of educational attainment. Establishing London as benchmark, seems to be both ambitious and achievable.
### Full list of measurements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Definition and Comments</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of people with Level 1 and above.</td>
<td>It measures the number of people with the first level or above. Data from the census show that the probability of being employed is 24 percentage points higher in people with Level 1 qualification compared to people with no qualifications.</td>
<td>ONS/Nomis - Annual population survey (Labour Force).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of people with Level 4 and above.</td>
<td>It measures the number of people with level four (4) or above. This level involves higher education awards which are associated with higher levels of income. Considering that we are not only interested in the level of employment, but also in the extent to which people improve their earnings, we consider it key to also track the proportion of the population with the highest levels of education.</td>
<td>ONS (Department of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Attainment 8 score per pupil.</td>
<td>This indicator captures the achievements of young people at the end of secondary school. In 2017, a new evaluation system based on the General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSEs) will be implemented grading pupils 9–1, rather than A*–G. The “Average attainment 8” score will reflect a weighted average grade across eight subjects (e.g. English and Maths are double weighted). Our measurement reflects the new way of measuring pupils’ educational achievements.</td>
<td>ONS (Department of Education)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Given the threat of climate change, worsening air pollution and limited resources, it is crucial to create a sustainable and respectful environment for everyone when promoting prosperity in the Borough. We have set the following target to achieve our environmental aspiration:

✓ Recycling higher and waste production lower than the London average.

7- RECYCLING HIGHER AND WASTE PRODUCTION LOWER THAN THE LONDON AVERAGE.

Key measurement described: Waste Production per household (Kg) and Recycling rates.

Current Trends:

- The rate of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting is currently 18.9% (London= 32%). In addition, household waste is 957.2 Kg/per household (London=586.2).
- Historic data from London and the UK in general suggest that both recycling and waste production tend to diminish their rate of improvement after reaching a certain point.
- An average yearly annual increase in recycling of 4% and 3.3% decrease in waste production is likely to close the gap with London.

Target Rationale:

- There is a significant gap in both measures compared to London. However, London seems to have reached levels after which large improvements are difficult to achieve.
- There are precedents of achieving in few years large improvements in both waste production and recycling rates at levels like the ones showed at LBBD.
Although it seems to be a very challenging target, it is feasible if the right policies are implemented (e.g. renegotiation of the contract with the collection authority to recycle larger variety of waste including glass, behavioural change initiatives, enforcement, etc).

**Full list of measurements:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Definition and Comments</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residual household waste per household (Ex NI191)</td>
<td>This indicator measures the number of kilograms of household waste collected that is not sent for reuse, recycling or is not composted or anaerobic digestion, per household in the Borough.</td>
<td>ONS / WasteDataFlow (Defra).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling or composting (Ex NI192).</td>
<td>This is a ratio in which the numerator represents the total tonnage of household waste collected which is sent for reuse, recycling, composting or anaerobic digestion. On the other hand, the denominator is the total tonnage of household waste collected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of &quot;Litter and dirt in the streets&quot;.</td>
<td>This measurement aims to capture the extent to which our borough is kept clean, (regardless of the production of waste or recycling rates). We are not aware of objective indicators currently measuring the cleanliness of public spaces at a borough level. Therefore, we will rely on the perceptions from our residents responding to our internal survey.</td>
<td>Residents Survey.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Engagement

We aim to have residents working together on projects and ideas that make their neighborhoods more exciting and enjoyable places to live. The engagement of the community is crucial to build our shared future. For that reason, we established the following target:

✓ At least 20% of residents regularly engaging with the community.

8- AT LEAST 20% OF RESIDENTS REGULARLY ENGAGING WITH THE COMMUNITY.

Key measurement described: Proportion of residents regularly engaging with Participatory City projects.

Target Rationale:

- General measurements regarding volunteering at a borough level are extremely difficult to find. Charities have no required statutory recording of use of volunteers. Some charities reported on this in their annual accounts but this information is patchy and does not allow any firm conclusions to be made. Moreover, in the LBBD’s State of Sector report it is argued that charities themselves do not keep clear records as to their use of volunteers, and the VCS report does not offer reliable information accounting for volunteering volumes.
- Measuring how residents get involved in initiatives related to “Participatory City” seems more feasible and aligned to the wider borough strategy.
- Research performed within the Participatory City project estimates that 27,000 people will be regularly engaged in the project by year 5. That amount of people would represent about 20% of the population older than 16 years old by that time. The aim is to at least keep the same proportion of participation in the long term.

Full list of measurements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Definition and Comments</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of residents regularly engaging with Participatory City.</td>
<td>Specific indicators of participation and residents' engagement will be developed for Participatory City by the end of 2017. These measurements will be incorporated as part of the Manifesto targets.</td>
<td>Internal data from Participatory City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People volunteering as reported in the Residents Survey.</td>
<td>Proportion of people reporting in the Residents Survey that they have formally volunteered in the last 12 months. This data can complement the limited information available regarding volunteering in the Borough. Even though this indicator does not allow us to make comparisons with other Boroughs, changes over time can be monitored.</td>
<td>Residents Survey.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**HOUSING**

We will ensure Barking and Dagenham is a place with sufficient, accessible and varied housing. BeFirst, our newly created regeneration company, will play a paramount role in achieving this aspiration by building high quality homes of mixed type, tenure and price across the borough; ensuring that residents benefit from new developments. In this regard, we have established the following ambitious target:

✓ Build 50,000 new homes over the next 25 years.

9. **BUILD 50,000 NEW HOMES OVER THE NEXT 25 YEARS.**

**Key measurement described:** Percentage of new homes built compared to annual target.

**Current Trends and target rationale:**

- During the last few years, LBBD has consistently failed to reach the target of new homes completed.
- The creation of a new body (Be First) to attract investment and encourage house building make us very optimistic about the prospects of achieving our aspiration.
- The specific number of new homes to be built has been established by Be First, and it is the product of careful planning.

![Figure 8: Net Completions Relative to London Plan (Monitoring) Target.](image)
Full list of measurements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Definition and Comments</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of new homes built compared to annual target.</td>
<td>This indicator accounts for the extent to which the internal annual targets regarding home building are achieved.</td>
<td>Internal data from Be First.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional affordable homes provided as a percentage of all net additional homes.</td>
<td>This is a ratio of net additional homes provided and the number of affordable homes delivered. Affordable housing is the sum of social rent, affordable rent, intermediate rent and affordable home ownership.</td>
<td>Department for Communities and Local Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of house prices to earnings.</td>
<td>We are interested in capturing not only whether new homes have low prices in relation to London, but also the extent to which residents can afford to buy a home considering their income. For that reason, we will be monitoring the ratio of house prices to median earnings, based on Land Registry house prices and ONS Earnings data.</td>
<td>Department for Communities and Local Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median monthly private sector rent for a 2-bedroom property.</td>
<td>Some people may either not be interested in or able to buy a new property. Therefore, we aim to have a borough offering more affordable rents than other places in London. Consequently, we will track the rent prices for the private sector which is the most prevalent type of renting. In addition, two bedroom properties will be used as a benchmark being the most representative type of property in the UK according to 2011 Census data.</td>
<td>Valuation Office Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council housing in decent condition.</td>
<td>Not only new homes, but also existent stock should have the quality conditions that our residents deserve, especially those more vulnerable. Therefore, we will monitor the percentage of local authority housing stock that is non-decent, as defined by the Dept. of Communities and Local Government.</td>
<td>Department for Communities and Local Government.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HEALTH AND WELLBEING

Our aspiration is to transform Barking and Dagenham into a place where residents receive the support needed to achieve independent, healthy, and fulfilling lives. We have established the following four targets to monitor our progress:

✓ Healthy weight better than the East London average.
✓ Personal wellbeing and happiness above the London average.
✓ Healthy life expectancy better than the London average.
✓ Rate of regular physical activity higher than the East London average.

10- HEALTHY WEIGHT BETTER THAN THE EAST LONDON AVERAGE.

Key measurement described: Percentage of Year-6 pupils with healthy weight.

Current Trends and target rationale:

- Current proportion of year-6 children with a BMI falling into the healthy weight group is 55.2% (East London= 57.4%).
- The healthy weight rate has been decreasing across London over the last 9 years, which means that Londoners are becoming less healthy.
- In order for LBBD to catch up to the East London rate, LBBD will need to show an annual average improvement of 0.2 percentage points greater than East London.

![Figure 9: Net Completions Relative to London Plan (Monitoring) Target.](image)
Target Rationale:

- The comparator for this target is East London. This area has been selected as a benchmark because the variables associated to unhealthy weight (e.g. levels of deprivation) are more similar to Barking and Dagenham and the current levels are extremely far from the average London values.
- Outer London boroughs such as Richmond upon Thames contribute to the outer London rate showing a bigger difference compared to LBBD. The population/demographics are also very different.
- We expect the healthy weight strategy to achieve the changes needed to increase the proportion of year 6 pupils who have a healthy weight.

Full list of measurements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Definition and Comments</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Year-6 pupils with healthy weight.</td>
<td>This indicator measures the proportion of year-6 children who fall within the Healthy Weight categories of the National Child Measurement Programme (NCMP). In the NCMP, pupils are grouped according to their Body Mass Index (BMI) given as a percentile plotted against a 1990 population sample reference curve. Considering that overweight/obese children are more likely to become obese adults, it is crucial to monitor and address unhealthy weight at an early age.</td>
<td>National Obesity Observatory (NOO) / Public Health England.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of obese adults.</td>
<td>This metric captures the proportion of adults with a BMI classified as Obese, calculated from the adjusted height and weight variables provided in the Active People Survey. Considering that this is a self-reported measurement from a sample survey, it is not as robust as the one from the NCMP, but it represents the best information publicly available for adults’ weight. We have decided to monitor the “Obese” group under the assumption that extreme cases would be more likely to be accurately classified.</td>
<td>Active People Survey (Sport England).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS admissions where obesity was a factor (per 100k p.).</td>
<td>We want to capture not only the proportion of people with unhealthy weight, but also the impact of those people on health services. In this regard, a measurement publicly available is the number of NHS admissions per 100,000 residents where obesity was a factor. The data contains information for inpatients only and therefore does not reflect all hospital activity. Outpatient procedures are not included in the figures due to the primary diagnosis code being poorly populated, and there being no certainty that procedures are for obesity diagnoses.</td>
<td>NHS Digital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 - PERSONAL WELLBEING AND HAPPINESS ABOVE THE LONDON AVERAGE.

Key measurement described: Average score of subjective well-being measurements.

Current Trends:

- An average of the variables “Life Satisfaction”, “Anxiety”, “Happiness” and “Worthiness” as measured by the ONS shows that LBBD is performing better than London on this measure.
- Because the source is a sample survey, it is worth considering that the differences are small and not statistically significant. This means that differences may be a consequence of random fluctuations.
Figure 10: Average score of subjective well-being measurements.

Target rationale:

- The target has recently been achieved.
- These types of variables have started to be measured in the UK just a few years ago. Establishing a more ambitious target seems premature, considering that it is still unclear what factors predict these variables.

Full list of measurements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Definition and Comments</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td>It captures the responses to the question: “Overall, how satisfied are you with your life nowadays?” Scores range from 0 to 10.</td>
<td>ONS - Annual Population Survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scores.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthiness scores.</td>
<td>It captures the responses to the question: “Overall, to what extent do you feel the things you do in your life are worthwhile?” Scores range from 0 to 10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness scores.</td>
<td>It captures the responses to the question: “Overall, how happy did you feel yesterday?” Scores range from 0 to 10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety scores.</td>
<td>It captures the responses to the question: “Overall, how anxious did you feel yesterday?” Scores range from 0 to 10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key measurement described: Healthy life expectancy at birth for both males and females.

Current Trends:

- Current healthy life expectancy (HLE) at birth in Barking and Dagenham is 59.8 years for males (London=64.11) and 58.5 years for females (London=64.12).
- HLE has been increasing on average by 0.4 years for both males and females.
- For Barking and Dagenham to have the same healthy life expectancy for its residents as London it is necessary for the yearly average change to be 0.4 percentage points better than London for males and 1 percentage point better for females.

![Graph showing healthy life expectancy at birth for males and females in Barking and Dagenham and London from 2009-11 to 2013-15.](image)

*Figure 11: Healthy life expectancy at birth.*
Target rationale:

- LBBD is already improving its expectancy at birth indicator faster than London over the last year (particularly for females), which make us feel optimistic about the possibility of catching up in the coming years.
- The figures reflect mortality among those living in the area in each time period, rather than mortality among those born in each area. Considering the high population attrition in the borough this indicator is likely to show drastic fluctuations.
- Healthy life expectancy at birth is not the actual number of years someone would be expected to live in good health if they were born now, as conditions will change over time. This measurement provides an indication of healthy life expectancy. Therefore, quick improvements on HLE can be expected as conditions improve in the borough because of the implementation of our long-term collaborative strategies.

Full list of measurements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Definition and Comments</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female healthy life expectancy at Birth.</td>
<td>The average number of years women would expect to live in good health based on population estimates, mortality rates and survey results. We have preferred to monitor the years that people are expected to live with “good health” (Healthy Life Expectancy), instead of the indicator measuring the amount of years that people are expected to live (Life Expectancy).</td>
<td>ONS - Public Health Outcomes Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male healthy life expectancy at Birth.</td>
<td>The average number of years men would expect to live in good health based on population estimates, mortality rates and survey results. We have preferred to monitor the years that people are expected to live with “good health” (Healthy Life Expectancy), instead of the indicator measuring the amount of years that people are expected to live (Life Expectancy).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13- RATE OF REGULAR PHYSICAL ACTIVITY HIGHER THAN EAST LONDON.

Key measurement described: Proportion of Active Residents (completing more than 150 minutes per week of moderate or vigorous intensity physical activity)

Current Trends:

- Residents in Barking and Dagenham are significantly less active (46.4% of residents surveyed) than the average in East London (53.8% of residents surveyed) and London (57.8% of residents surveyed).
- While the rest of London have in average become more active over time, Barking and Dagenham has not shown significant improvements in recent years.
Target rationale:

- Sport England classified people as “Active” when they complete more than 150 minutes per week of moderate or vigorous intensity physical activity. The measurement captures a large number of possible activities and represents a widely accepted indicator.
- There are wide variations across London in terms of Physical Activity, but very strong patterns are clear. Central and South West London have significantly larger proportions of physical activity. This will be for many reasons, including different environments, infrastructure and population characteristics. Consequently, it makes sense to use the East London average as a comparator considering that area is more similar to Barking and Dagenham.
- Considering that increases in physical activity also rely heavily on attitudes and behaviours, we strongly believe that by implementing the right strategies large improvements can be achieved.

Full list of measurements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Definition and Comments</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of active residents.</td>
<td>The indicator is defined as more than 150 minutes per week of Moderate or Vigorous Intensity Physical Activity. It includes an extensive range of activities.</td>
<td>Active People Survey (Sport England).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of people walking 30 to 90 mins at least once a week.</td>
<td>Walking is probably the easiest physical activity to perform and therefore, it is valuable to monitor it. The vast majority of people currently walk less than 30 minutes at least once a week. However, we have decided to establish a more ambitious target, and monitor the amount of people walking 30 to 90 minutes at least once per week.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of people cycling 30 to 90 mins at least once a week.</td>
<td>Increasing cycling is an ambition across London and particularly in LBBD. Future infrastructure will be designed to encourage this activity. Consequently, we consider it important to monitor the proportion of people cycling. The vast majority of people currently cycle less than 30 minutes at least once a week. However, we have decided to establish a more ambitious target, and track the amount of people cycling 30 to 90 minutes at least once per week.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information please contact: CE-Strategy@lbbd.gov.uk