Ward profiles have been produced as spine charts in order to summarise a great deal of information into a relatively succinct format. Spine charts have been used for the health profiles produced by the Public Health Observatories for a number of years.

How to interpret the ward profiles:-

- The red line down the centre of the chart represents the Southampton City average value for each indicator. The data has been normalised which means that values to the left of the red line are ‘worse’ than the City average and those to the right are ‘better’.

- The circles on the chart are the ward values. Circles coloured blue indicate that the ward value is statistically significantly different from the City average, yellow circles indicate that any difference is not significant and white circles indicate that significance could not be calculated.

- The white diamonds on the spine chart give the locality average.

- The light grey bar for each indicator shows the range of values for the ward in the City (i.e. it stretches from the value for the ‘worst’ ward to the value for the ‘best’ ward).

- The darker grey shading shows the range of values for the middle 50% of wards.

Data Sources and Notes:-

4. Child Poverty 2007: HM Revenue & Customs. Number of children living in families in receipt of CTC whose reported income is less than 60 per cent of the median income in or in receipt of IS or (Income-Based) JSA, divided by the total number of children in the area (determined by Child Benefit data). All dependent children under the age of 20.
6. Child Poverty 2007: HM Revenue & Customs. Number of children living in families in receipt of CTC whose reported income is less than 60 per cent of the median income in or in receipt of IS or (Income-Based) JSA, divided by the total number of children in the area (determined by Child Benefit data). All dependent children under the age of 20.
8. Under 18 conception rate per 1000 females aged 15-17, 2005-07 pooled. Office for National Statistics and Teenage Pregnancy Unit. Ward values and rates have been suppressed in accordance with ONS policy but relative position can be seen from the chart.
9. Percentage of mothers breastfeeding at initial health visit 2007/08-2009/10 SUHT, HCCS
10. Percentage of pregnant women smoking at time of midwife booking 2007/08 - 2009/10 SUHT, HCCS
11. Percentage of Year 6 children who are obese 2006/07 to 2008/09 pooled. Southampton Child Health Information System.
13. Disability Living Allowance August 2009 per 1000 population aged 16+. NOMIS This data includes all levels of DLA with any disabling condition, ONS Lower Layer Super Output Areas, Mid 2008.
14. Hospital admissions for fractured Proximal Femur Admissions - 2004/05 to 2008/09 (pooled) directly standardised rate per 100,000. SUS Hospital Activity Data & ONS Mid Year Population Estimates pro-rated using Hampshire County Council Small Area Population Forecasts, Primary Diagnosis S7200-S7209, S7210-S7219, S7220-S7229.
17. Under 18 conception rate per 1000 females aged 15-17, 2005-07 pooled. Office for National Statistics and Teenage Pregnancy Unit. Ward values and rates have been suppressed in accordance with ONS policy but relative position can be seen from the chart.
18. Percentage of pregnant women smoking at time of midwife booking 2007/08 - 2009/10 SUHT, HCCS
19. Percentage of Year 6 children who are obese 2006/07 to 2008/09 pooled. Southampton Child Health Information System.
20. Alcohol-related hospital admissions directly standardised rates per 100,000 for 2004/05 to 2008/09 (pooled). SUS Hospital Admissions Data & ONS Mid Year Population Estimates pro-rated using Hampshire County Council Small Area Population Forecasts.
Financially secure older couples living in owner occupied properties

Elderly singles with low mobility, reliant on public services for support

Low income older couples approaching retirement, living in low rise council housing

Childless, young, high rise council tenants with issues of social isolation

Vulnerable young families or lone parents living on council housing estates

Middle-aged owner occupiers making some use of public services

Diverse private renters in older terraced properties

Middle-aged lower income couples & families in right-to-buy homes

Comfortably-off, families who lead active yet busy lifestyles

Young couples, new to the area, in privately rented purpose-built flats

Students living in shared houses or flats near to the city centre

Transient young singles with weak support networks, living in a mixture of housing

Students living with like-minded people in halls of residence

Affluent professionals living in large detached properties out of the city centre

Well qualified, young professionals living in purpose-built prestigious locations

All households in Southampton (102,582 households) have been classified into one of 15 MOSAIC segments according to their social, economic and cultural behaviours. The 15 groups are specific to Southampton because local data has been included in the classification process. Clearly the groups are generalisations; individual households in the City will only ‘approximate’ to these groups rather than match exactly. The value of the MOSAIC groups is in understanding the characteristics of the City’s population in terms their lifestyles and methods of communication that they are most likely to respond to (social marketing). Thus this can provide some valuable insights about the population.

Caveats around use of Mosaic Data:-

These descriptions are therefore what sociologists would describe as 'ideal types', pure examples to which individual cases approximate only with various degrees of exactness. They focus on the statistical bias of a type of neighbourhood, on the demographic categories which are more numerous there than elsewhere in the area and which give the neighbourhood its distinctive character. In addition, because the boundaries of postcodes and census output areas do not exactly match boundaries in housing type, it is inevitable that addresses close to the boundary of many output areas may in certain cases not appear to have been allocated to the most suitable category. There are cases too where the same types of neighbourhood will contain people of similar character and behaviour but living in very different types of accommodation according to where in the area they may live.

Experian who produced this data using the Mosaic tool have taken account of a wealth of information from both census and non census sources - such as the electoral register, shareholder and directors' lists, and local levels of council tax. This information is supplemented with information from market research surveys which can be cross tabulated by Mosaic, including the ONS Annual Expenditure and Family Survey, University of Essex’s British Household Panel Survey, Research Now’s online panel, YouGov’s specialist financial survey, GfK NOP’s Financial Research Survey, BMRB’s Target Group Index Survey, Experian Hitwise’s online competitor intelligence, the National Readership Survey and the British Crime Survey.
Bargate has a population of around 16,800 making it the largest ward in Southampton. Bargate’s demography reflects the large number of students and young adults living in the ward. With much residential development here it is forecast to see more population growth than any other City ward.

This large student population gives Bargate ward a rather skewed profile which can affect the calculation of other indicators. The large denominator population may well have resulted in the low rates of benefit claimants when actually child poverty in Bargate ward is the highest in the City – with 46.7% of children living in poverty.

Teenage conception rates have been high in this ward for a number of years. However, overall breastfeeding rates are high and smoking in pregnancy is relatively low.

Alcohol is an issue in Bargate ward with alcohol-related hospital admission rates higher than the City average.

According to its MOSAIC profile, Bargate is dominated by a young adult population which ranges from transient young singles to students and well qualified young professionals.
In 2010 Bassett had an estimated 13,900 residents. This ward has a large population of 18-24 year olds and also a greater proportion of older residents than the City average. The large number of students living in this ward skews the population profile and will affect the calculation of some indicators.

Generally this ward has high life expectancy and low mortality compared to the City average. Nevertheless issues such as smoking, physical activity and healthy eating remain significant to Bassett residents.

The MOSAIC profile of Bassett ward reflects the older owner occupiers and the affluent professional families living in the area.
Bevois ward’s population was about 14,800 in 2010; it is dominated by young adults, particularly students, and it also has higher than average numbers of young children. The area is forecast to see an increase in population over the next few years through residential development and fertility rates are also high in this area.

Bevois experiences significant levels of deprivation – with over 40% of children living in poverty.

Lifestyle issues are important for Bevois residents with higher than average levels of child obesity and alcohol-related hospital admission rates.

Mortality issues are important for Bevois residents with higher than average levels of child obesity and alcohol-related hospital admission rates.

Mortality rates are higher here than for any other City ward; premature mortality from circulatory disease has a rate of 146.9 per 100,000 compared to 86.6 across Southampton as a whole.

The MOSAIC profile for Bevois ward shows how students dominate the area but also highlights the presence of significant numbers of ‘diverse private renters’ who are likely to have children and be on low incomes.
In 2010 there were about 13,500 residents in Bitterne ward. This area has a higher proportion of young children than anywhere else in Southampton with fertility rates also higher here than in any other ward.

In May 2010 there were 2,025 people of working age in Bitterne ward claiming benefit resulting in a higher rate than anywhere else in the City.

Nearly 40% of children are estimated to be living in poverty in this ward and breastfeeding rates are very low here whilst smoking in pregnancy is very high.

Alcohol is an issue in Bitterne ward and life expectancy here is lower than the City average. Mortality rates from COPD and cancer are particularly high.

The MOSAIC profile shows that Bitterne has high number of residents living in social housing, with much deprivation and issues of social exclusion.
In 2010 the population of Bitterne Park ward was estimated to be 14,100. Bitterne Park has proportions of young children and old people that broadly match the City average but there are not significant numbers of students living here. Fertility rates are lower than average.

There is less evidence of deprivation in Bitterne Park and mortality rates here are lower than the City average.

Health issues of significance to residents of Bitterne Park are the same as those across much of England – smoking, physical activity and healthy eating to mention but a few.

The MOSAIC profile of Bitterne Park reveals many young couples and families living on relatively good incomes.
Coxford’s population is around 13,800 and its profile is similar to the City average although with a far lower proportion in the student age range. The area is actually forecast to see a population decline over the next few years which is the result of falling average household size meaning the existing dwelling stock accommodates fewer people.

Coxford ward has higher than average proportions of working age residents claiming benefits. Additionally there were 890 people claiming disability living allowance in Coxford in August 2009 giving a high rate compared to the City average.

Breastfeeding rates are low in this ward whilst alcohol-related hospital admissions are high.

Mortality rates are similar to the City average but mortality from COPD is significantly higher in Coxford suggesting this may be a particular issue in the ward.

Coxford residents are predominantly families and older people on low incomes according to its MOSAIC profile.
**Public Health Ward Profiles: 2010/11**

**Southampton North & Central Locality**

**00MSMY - Freemantle**

Freemantle’s population was just over 15,000 in 2010 and its demographic structure is very similar to the City average.

Child poverty and the number of people claiming benefits in this ward is lower than the average for Southampton.

Teenage conception rates are higher than the City average but not significantly so and rates of breastfeeding and smoking in pregnancy are comparatively good here.

Although mortality rates are generally lower here than across the City as a whole, key health issues such as obesity, diet and smoking remain significant in this ward.

The MOSAIC profile for Freemantle reveals a ward with many young people – ranging from students to professionals.
In 2010 Harefield had an estimated 13,700 residents. This ward has an older population profile than the Southampton average – with 19.5% of its residents being over 65 years it has the oldest population of any of the City’s wards. The area is actually forecast to see a population decline over the next few years which is likely to be the result of falling average household size. Fertility rates are high in this ward.

Rates of claiming benefits amongst the working age population are significantly higher in Harefield than the City average. In 2009 there were 755 people claiming Disability Living Allowance in this ward giving a claimant rate significantly higher than the Southampton average.

Breastfeeding rates are poor in Harefield ward and smoking in pregnancy rates are high although not significantly different from the City average.

Life expectancy and mortality rates in this ward are very similar to the City average.

The MOSAIC profile for Harefield shows that the ward is characterised by middle aged and older couples and families with moderate incomes. However, there are also significant numbers of younger people on lower incomes and experiencing issues of social isolation.
In 2010 Millbrook had a population of about 15,600. This ward has relatively high proportions of young children compared to the City as a whole. Fertility rates are slightly higher than the City average here although not significantly so.

The proportion of people of working age who are claiming benefits is high in Millbrook ward.

Alcohol is a significant issue in this area with rates of alcohol-related hospital admissions higher than the Southampton average.

Mortality rates in Millbrook are generally similar to the City average.

The MOSAIC profile for Millbrook reveals an area of contrasts with some families on good incomes in owner occupied properties but also some very elderly and deprived residents and also some younger low income couples and families.
Peartree ward has fewer young adults and students than the City average. Its total population is estimated to be about 13,450 and it is not set to see any rise in population over the next few years. Fertility rates are slightly higher here than the City average but not significantly so.

Benefit claimant rates are high here although child poverty is lower than average. In 2009 there were 770 Peartree residents claiming Disability Living Allowance giving rates significantly higher than the Southampton average.

Mortality rates and life expectancy are generally better than the Southampton average.

Peartree’s MOSAIC profile shows that the population of this ward is broadly classified as middle-aged families on moderate to good incomes.
Public Health Ward Profiles: 2010/11
Southampton North & Central Locality
00MSNC - Portswood

Portswood has a population of around 14,700 and it is a ward dominated by the presence of a large number of students. It has a lower proportion of young children than any ward and over 28% of residents are aged 18-24 years which is significantly higher than the City average.

The presence of such a large number of students in the denominator population affects the calculation of other indicators and this should be borne in mind in interpreting the spine chart.

Fertility rates are very low in this ward – again this is an effect of the fact that a large number of the women of child-bearing age are students.

The MOSAIC profile for Portswood ward is dominated by the student segments and also by other young people tending to be single and living in a mixture of housing.
Redbridge has a population of around 14,450 and has higher than average proportions of young children and also significantly higher fertility rates.

Benefit claimant rates are high in this ward; 21.3% of the working age population are claiming benefits and over 85 people per 1000 are claiming disability living allowance. Over 36% of children in Redbridge are estimated to be living in poverty.

Breastfeeding rates are very poor in this ward and smoking in pregnancy is high.

Alcohol-related hospital admission rates are high in Redbridge and life expectancy for both males and females is significantly lower here than the City average.

The MOSAIC data shows that Redbridge ward has residents on lower incomes of all ages – young singles, young families, middle-aged and older couples.
In 2010 Shirley ward was estimated to have a population of over 14,200. This ward has higher proportions of young children and older people than the City average. Fertility rates in this ward are higher than the Southampton average but not significantly so.

Residents in Shirley generally score ‘better’ on the indicators in this health profile than the Southampton average. However, this may mask particular issues at small geographies within the ward. Issues such as diet, physical activity, smoking and alcohol remain very significant to the residents of Shirley ward.

According to its MOSAIC profile, Shirley ward is dominated by families on higher incomes. However, there are also significant numbers of younger couples living in privately rented accommodation and families with young children who are on low incomes.
Sholing ward has about 13,600 residents with an older population profile than the Southampton average. The proportion of Sholing’s residents claiming benefits is significantly lower than the City average.

Generally Sholing performs better than average for most of the indicators on the health profile. However, residents in Sholing will still have significant health issues and lifestyle factors such as smoking, obesity and alcohol remain important here.

The MOSAIC profile for Sholing reveals a mix of families on good incomes alongside families and older people living on far more moderate incomes.
Swaythling ward has 13,300 residents and a higher proportion of 18-24 year olds than any other ward in Southampton reflecting the large number of students who reside in this area. As previously mentioned, a large student population skews the population profile of an area as such a large, relatively healthy denominator population can distort indicator values. For instance, the fertility rate in Swaythling ward is much lower than average because a large number of the women of child-bearing age are students.

Child poverty in this ward is an issue with nearly 35% of children estimated to be living in poverty.

The MOSAIC profile for Swaythling reveals that the largest population group is actually middle aged families on moderate income although students are also a significant group.
In 2010 Woolston ward was estimated to have a population of around 13,600. This area has a higher proportion of young children than the City average and also relatively high fertility rates. This ward is anticipated to see population growth of around 7% between 2010 and 2016 based on planned residential development.

Benefit claimant rates are high in Woolston and over 31% of children are estimated to be living in poverty.

Woolston ward has a higher rate of hospital admission for hip fracture than any other Southampton ward.

Life expectancy for males is significantly lower in Woolston than the city average.

According to its MOSAIC profile, Woolston has large numbers of young singles on low incomes as well as poorer older couples and families. However, there are also significant numbers of families on good incomes living in owner occupied accommodation.