

## Tees Valley Migration Study (Amended) – 2001 Census

### 1 Introduction

- 1.1 This report was re-released following the correction to errors in Appendix D which related to Socio-Economic Groups. Amended commentary appears in sections 6.4 to 6.9.
- 1.2 The report analyses migration patterns within, and to and from, the Tees Valley, using 2001 Census data. The primary focus is on flows from and to the Wards of the Tees Valley that have seen either large gains or large losses in population since the 1991 Census.

### 2 Data Sources

- 2.1 This analysis uses data from the 2001 Census Special Migration Statistics, which looks at all moves one year prior to 2001 Census day. The data are supplied for Wards existing in 2003 i.e. Wards as used in the published 2001 Census results. This affects Hartlepool and Stockton-on-Tees which have had ward boundary changes since 2003. There are a number of movers (around 7% of all moves in the Tees Valley) who failed to indicate an address from the previous year; these are coded as having "No Previous Address". All the following results exclude these movers.

### 3 Tees Valley and District Results

- 3.1 Table 1 shows the proportion of moves for those who lived in the Tees Valley at the time of the 2001 Census but who had a different address one year before.

**Table 1 : Moves INTO and WITHIN Tees Valley**

Destination	Moves Within Wards	Moves Within Districts #	Moves From Within Tees Valley #	Moves From OUTSIDE Tees Valley *	Number of Moves
Darlington	18%	68%	73%	27%	11,100
Hartlepool	26%	81%	85%	15%	9,700
Middlesbrough	24%	69%	81%	19%	14,200
Redcar & Cleveland	31%	74%	85%	15%	12,200
Stockton-on-Tees	23%	69%	81%	19%	18,100
Tees Valley	24%	72%	81%	19%	65,300

Notes # The second and third columns are cumulative figures i.e. Moves within District includes Moves within Wards. Moves from within Tees Valley includes both within Wards and within Districts moves.

- This includes moves from outside the UK.

- 3.2 Redcar & Cleveland had the highest proportion of moves within Wards accounting for nearly a third of all identifiable moves. Darlington had the lowest proportion.
- 3.3 Hartlepool had the highest proportion of moves within Districts with 81% compared to below 70% in Darlington, Middlesbrough and Stockton-on-Tees.

This reflects the generally more separate nature of Hartlepool as a housing market.

- 3.4 Darlington and Hartlepool attract relatively few movers from elsewhere in the Tees Valley – just 4% of moves, while Middlesbrough, R&C and Stockton-on-Tees take between 11% and 12%. This reinforces the concept of Darlington and Hartlepool being more separate in terms of housing markets. Of the Tees Valley residents who had moved house a year prior to the 2001 Census, over 80% had remained within the Tees Valley.
- 3.5 Moves from outside the Tees Valley accounted for 27% of moves in Darlington, almost double the proportion of Hartlepool and Redcar & Cleveland. Darlington has more links and opportunities with areas outside the Tees Valley and this is reflected in the significantly higher proportion of movers in from outside the sub-region.
- 3.6 Table 2 shows the proportion of moves for those who lived in the Tees Valley a year before the 2001 Census but who had a different address on Census day.

**Table 2 : Moves FROM the Tees Valley**

<b>Origin</b>	<b>Moves To Within Tees Valley</b>	<b>Moves To OUTSIDE Tees Valley *</b>	<b>Number of Moves</b>
Darlington	74%	26%	10,800
Hartlepool	85%	15%	9,800
Middlesbrough	81%	19%	15,000
Redcar & Cleveland	83%	17%	12,700
Stockton-on-Tees	80%	20%	17,300
Tees Valley	81%	19%	65,600

*Notes \* This EXCLUDES moves to outside the UK as these moves are not identifiable.*

- 3.7 This shows very similar patterns for the Within Tees Valley moves to the table in 3.1 as the total number of identifiable moves IN and OUT of the Tees Valley is very similar. Again, the proportion of moves originating in Tees Valley Districts to outside the Tees Valley is much higher in Darlington than any other District; again, this may reflect its geographic location.
- 3.8 These Tables demonstrate that most moves are short distance, representing people moving to a more suitable house as close as possible to their existing friends and family. The majority of moves to and from neighbouring Districts for the Tees Valley will also be seeking a more suitable house. The longer distance moves will mainly result from people moving jobs.

#### **4 Main Gaining and Losing Wards**

- 4.1 Two of the main interests in the migration patterns is to look at, firstly, where the people coming to the “gaining” Wards are coming from to and, secondly, where people from the “losing” Wards are going. The wards shown in Table 3 were selected using the percentage population and household changes between the 1991 and 2001 Censuses. The main “gaining” Wards were all areas where major new build has taken place since 1991. The main “losing” Wards were generally areas with poorer housing and other deprivation issues.

**Table 3 : Main Gaining and Losing Wards**

District	Gaining Wards	Losing Wards
Darlington	Middleton St. George	Eastbourne
		Haughton North
		Northgate
Hartlepool	Throston	Dyke House
		Owton
		Rossmere
District	Gaining Wards	Losing Wards
Middlesbrough	Coulby Newham	Hemlington
		Middlehaven
		Thorntree
Redcar & Cleveland	West Dyke	Grangetown
		Kirkleatham
		South Bank
Stockton-on-Tees	Ingleby Barwick	Hardwick
		Roseworth
		Stainsby

4.2 Table 4 gives an overview of the where the movers to these sorts of areas are coming from.

**Table 4 : Moves INTO Gaining Wards**

Gaining Wards Moves TO...	Moves Within Wards	Moves Within Districts #	Moves From Within Tees Valley #	Moves From OUTSIDE Tees Valley *	Number of Moves
Middleton St. George	16%	49%	76%	24%	590
Throston	19%	78%	82%	18%	795
Coulby Newham	25%	66%	81%	19%	830
West Dyke	21%	80%	89%	11%	825
Ingleby Barwick	25%	48%	75%	25%	2,445

Notes # The second and third columns are cumulative figures i.e. Moves within District includes Moves within Wards. Moves from within Tees Valley includes both within Wards and within Districts moves.

- This includes moves from outside the UK. One in four of moves in Coulby Newham and Ingleby Barwick were moves from within their own Ward.
- The above table also demonstrates very clearly the difference between the housing markets. For Throston Ward (Throston and Middle Warren sites) in Hartlepool and West Dyke Ward (Ings and Mickledales sites) in Redcar & Cleveland, most moves (around 80%) were from within their own District. For Middleton St. George in Darlington and Ingleby Barwick in Stockton-on-Tees it was fewer than a half – this partly reflects the fact that they are close to another district. The balance of the moves for these two wards was more or less evenly split between movers from elsewhere in the Tees Valley and from outside the Tees Valley.
- For Middleton St. George in Darlington and Ingleby Barwick in Stockton-on-Tees around one quarter of moves were from outside the Tees Valley. This compared to only one in ten moves for the Redcar Ward of West Dyke. For Middleton St. George the largest number of moves was from County Durham (4%), for Ingleby Barwick the largest number of moves was from Outside the UK (3%) and from Hambleton (3%) but there were also a large number of smaller moves from nearly 80 other UK Districts.
- West Dyke has so few movers from outside the Tees Valley partly because it is the furthest from significant population areas outside the Tees Valley. The other areas are generally more conveniently located for the main employment areas of the Tees

Valley. The fact that Middleton St. George and Ingleby Barwick have the highest proportions may be related to their being closest to the main communication links (road, rail, air) to other areas of the country for people to visit 'home'.

4.3 Table 5 shows where the movers from the main areas of growth are moving to.

**Table 5 : Moves FROM Gaining Wards**

<b>Gaining Wards Moves FROM...</b>	Moves Within Wards	Moves Within Districts #	Moves To Within Tees Valley #	Moves To OUTSIDE Tees Valley *	Number of Moves
Middleton St. George	31%	51%	64%	36%	315
Throston	24%	74%	78%	22%	610
Coulby Newham	26%	64%	81%	19%	820
West Dyke	29%	74%	80%	20%	600
Ingleby Barwick	40%	59%	73%	27%	1,505

*Notes # The second and third columns are cumulative figures i.e. Moves within District includes Moves within Wards. Moves from within Tees Valley includes both within Wards and within Districts moves.*

*\* This EXCLUDES moves to outside the UK.*

- Two fifths of moves from Ingleby Barwick were to elsewhere in the Ward. This reflects the large number of new houses available and the size of the Ward.
- Three quarters of moves from Throston and West Dyke were to elsewhere in the same District.
- Middleton St. George in Darlington and Ingleby Barwick in Stockton-on-Tees had comparatively high proportions of moves to outside the Tees Valley. Richmondshire was the most popular single location for Middleton St. George movers (2%) and Hambleton for Ingleby Barwick (6%). There was no particular pattern to the other moves other than being thinly and widespread.

4.4 This analysis is aimed at giving an overview of where people who are leaving declining (1991-2001) areas are going to. Three Wards from each district have been looked at in detail and the results are shown in Table 6.

**Table 6 : Moves FROM Losing Wards**

<b>Darlington Losing Wards Moves from...</b>	Moves Within Wards	Moves Within Districts #	Moves To Within Tees Valley #	Moves To OUTSIDE Tees Valley *	Number of Moves
Eastbourne	24%	80%	82%	18%	720
Haughton North	10%	63%	70%	30%	380
Northgate	13%	71%	75%	25%	760

*Notes : see below*

<b>Hartlepool Losing Wards Moves from...</b>	Moves Within Wards	Moves Within Districts #	Moves To Within Tees Valley #	Moves To OUTSIDE Tees Valley *	Number of Moves
Dyke House	28%	83%	90%	10%	855
Owton	34%	87%	92%	8%	595
Rossmere	28%	82%	86%	14%	455

*Notes : see below*

<b>Middlesbrough</b> Losing Wards Moves from...	Moves Within Wards	Moves Within Districts #	Moves To Within Tees Valley #	Moves To OUTSIDE Tees Valley *	Number of Moves
Hemlington	30%	69%	88%	12%	700
Middlehaven	18%	69%	78%	22%	915
Thorntree	28%	75%	91%	9%	675

*Notes : see below*

<b>Redcar &amp; Cleveland</b> Wards Moves from...	Moves Within Wards	Moves Within Districts #	Moves To Within Tees Valley #	Moves To OUTSIDE Tees Valley *	Number of Moves
Grangetown	45%	84%	94%	6%	705
Kirkleatham	22%	79%	89%	11%	835
South Bank	40%	73%	88%	12%	860

*Notes : see below*

<b>Stockton-on-Tees</b> Wards Moves from...	Moves Within Wards	Moves Within Districts #	Moves To Within Tees Valley #	Moves To OUTSIDE Tees Valley *	Number of Moves
Hardwick	26%	81%	88%	12%	645
Roseworth	17%	78%	85%	15%	430
Stainsby	28%	84%	92%	8%	580

*Notes # The second and third columns are cumulative figures i.e. Moves within District includes Moves within Wards. Moves from within Tees Valley includes both within Wards and within Districts moves.*

*\* This includes moves from outside the UK.*

**The following comments relate to the wards identified above.**

- South Bank and Grangetown had the two highest proportions of within Ward moves. Within Ward moves were particularly low among two of the Darlington Wards.
- Deprived non-town centre Wards i.e. Hemlington, Thorntree, South Bank - though not Grangetown, have high proportions moving out of their District.
- Nearly nine out of ten moves were to within the Tees Valley except for the three Darlington Wards and Middlehaven where the proportion was less than 8 out of ten.
- Hartlepool, Middlesbrough (except Middlehaven) Redcar & Cleveland and Stockton-on-Tees had low proportions (fewer than one in six) of people moving outside the Tees Valley. Northgate in Darlington (most moves to Sedgfield 3%, Croydon, Northampton and Newcastle-upon-Tyne all 2%), Haughton North in Darlington (most moves to Richmondshire 3%, Teesdale 3%) and Middlehaven in Middlesbrough (most moves Leeds 3%) had more than one in five moves to outside the Tees Valley.

## 5 Review of All Wards

These comments have been mainly based on looking at those wards which are rather above or below the district average, concentrating on moves between Tees Valley districts and outside Tees Valley moves.

- 5.1 Looking at the data on all Wards within the Tees Valley shows many informative patterns. A full list of moves into the Tees Valley Wards is shown in Appendix A and the moves out of the Tees Valley is shown in Appendix B. The detailed Census data from which this information is derived make it possible to list individual districts or wards which were the origins or destinations for each ward's moves.
- 5.2 **Within Ward Moves** - Ward with high levels of within ward moves tended to be disadvantaged wards. The exceptions (more advantaged with high within ward moves) being Hurworth in Darlington, Hart in Hartlepool and Yarm in Stockton. Conversely, the more advantaged areas had lower proportions, the exceptions to this (less advantaged with low within ward moves) being Middlehaven, Park and Stainton & Thornton in Middlesbrough, and the Redcar wards of Coatham, Newcomen, and Zetland (all of which have high net flows to West Dyke) in Redcar & Cleveland. Redcar & Cleveland, which had the highest proportion of within ward moves in the Tees Valley, had two wards where over half the moves were within ward - these were Brotton and Loftus in East Cleveland.
- 5.3 **Other Within Tees Valley Moves** - Moves To and FROM other Tees Valley districts are very much concentrated on those close to the borders, e.g. Middleton St. George and Sadberge and Whessoe in Darlington; Elwick in Hartlepool; Beckfield, Brookfield, Marton West, Nunthorpe and Stainton & Thornton in Middlesbrough; Ormesby and Normanby in Redcar & Cleveland and Ingleby Barwick and Whitton in Stockton-on-Tees.
- 5.4 Middlesbrough's relatively small geographical size allows short moves to either Stockton-on-Tees or Redcar & Cleveland, hence its much higher percentage of moves to and from elsewhere in the Tees Valley. The wards of Acklam, Beechwood and Ladgate also had above average proportion of moves within the Tees Valley.
- 5.5 Ormesby in Redcar & Cleveland had an exceptionally high proportion of moves both INTO and OUT of other Tees Valley districts at over 40%, the only Tees Valley ward to have a lower proportion of within district moves than moves to other Tees Valley districts. This high level may largely high numbers of moves to and from the adjacent Beckfield and Nunthorpe wards in Middlesbrough. It is noticeable that these two wards have the highest proportions of migrants both to and from other Tees Valley districts amongst Middlesbrough wards.
- 5.6 **Moves TO and FROM Adjoining Districts** - Moves TO and FROM adjoining districts outside the Tees Valley, as might be expected, tend to be higher in those wards that are next to these boundaries. These include Heighington & Coniscliffe and Sadberge & Whessoe in Darlington; Elwick in Hartlepool; Nunthorpe and Marton West in Middlesbrough; Loftus and Westworth in Redcar & Cleveland and Egglecliffe, Whitton and Yarm in Stockton-on-Tees.
- 5.7 **Moves TO and FROM Elsewhere in the UK** - Moves TO and FROM elsewhere in the UK are lower in the deprived wards (less attractive for new arrivals, lower income of residents making it harder to move). These include Cockerton West, Eastbourne and North Road in Darlington; Dyke House, Owton and Fens in Hartlepool; Ayresome, Beckfield, North Ormesby & Brambles Farm, Pallister,

Park End and Thorntree in Middlesbrough; Grangetown, South Bank and Teesville in Redcar & Cleveland and Mile House, Newtown, Portrack & Tilery, St. Aidan's, Stainsby and Village in Stockton-on-Tees.

- 5.8 The exceptions to this, amongst deprived wards, are the wards that are close to Teesside University namely Middlehaven, University and Gresham wards in Middlesbrough.
- 5.9 Other than the three "university" wards in Middlesbrough, higher percentage of moves TO other UK districts, and moves FROM other UK districts and FROM outside UK are generally TO affluent areas or areas of substantial new build. These include Faverdale, Heighington & Coniscliffe, Hummersknot and Hurworth in Darlington; Elwick, Grange and Park in Hartlepool; Marton, Marton West and Nunthorpe in Middlesbrough; Hutton, Westworth and Zetland in Redcar & Cleveland and Egglecliffe, Ingleby Barwick, Norton, Preston, Whitton and Yarm in Stockton-on-Tees.

## 6 Nature of Migrants

### Overseas Migrants

- 6.1 Appendix C shows the characteristics of moves into the Tees Valley from Outside the UK. These are relatively small in number (1,800 of 65,300) accounting for around 3% of all moves IN.
- 6.2 Of those migrants aged 16-74, 16% were students, 53% were economically active and 31% inactive (see Table C1). There were large differences between the districts, with students representing over 40% of Middlesbrough's overseas migrants whereas all other districts, students represented 10% or lower. Redcar & Cleveland had the highest proportion of economically inactive migrants (over half). Economic activity data for migrants are not available at ward level.
- 6.3 The wards around Teesside University, Gresham, Middlehaven and University, took 15% of the Tees Valley total and 60% of Middlesbrough's. Other areas tended to be deprived wards suggesting perhaps these areas were the only places these migrants could move to due to affordability or availability at the time of the Census- these include Central in Darlington; Brus and Jackson in Hartlepool; the three "university" wards in Middlesbrough; Kirkleatham, Newcomen and South Bank in Redcar & Cleveland; Northfield and Parkfield in Stockton-on-Tees.

### Socio-Economic Classification (NS-SEC)

- 6.4 The socio-economic classification of migrants, especially the high proportions of migrants who are professional/managerial, shows further useful information - see Appendix D. The figures all exclude moves within the Tees Valley.
- 6.5 The comparison of the NS-SEC for the **Resident Population** (based on Household Reference Person - See Table D4) with **those who have moved INTO** the Tees Valley shows a significantly higher proportion of the Professional/Managerial classification moving into Tees Valley districts with the exception of Middlesbrough where the proportion is lower (Middlesbrough's figures are distorted by the large number of Students). Intermediate and Semi-Routine classifications have a similar profile to those moving into the Tees Valley while for Lower Supervisory/Technical and Routine classifications there were lower proportions moving into the Tees Valley than were resident here. The

comparison of Students is complicated by Halls of residence/Students flats meaning only those living in (and heading up i.e. oldest or first on Census form) private households are counted as Household Reference Persons (2% in the Tees Valley) but Students are counted as Group Reference Persons and accounted for 39% of moves into Middlesbrough compared with between 4% and 9% for the other Tees Valley districts. Never worked/Long term Unemployed classification accounted for 5% of moves compared with 3% of those living here .

- 6.6 **For moves OUT** of the Tees Valley compared to the **resident NS-SEC profile**, Tees Valley shows a significantly higher proportion of the Professional/Managerial classification moving OUT of Tees Valley for all districts (37% vs 24%). Intermediate and Semi-Routine classifications have a similar profile to those moving out of the Tees Valley while for Lower Supervisory/Technical and Routine classifications there were lower proportions moving out of the Tees Valley than were resident here. The problem of comparison of Students is covered above though Students accounted for 15% of moves out of the Tees Valley. Never worked/Long term Unemployed classification accounted for a similar proportion of moves (3%) compared with those living here.
- 6.7 Roughly half the moves **INTO** the Tees Valley were for Professional/Managerial and Intermediate classifications however this varied from (See Table D1) from 27% (Middlesbrough) to 55% (Darlington). Lower supervisory, Semi-routine and Routine classifications made up between 20% to 28% of moves, while the Never worked/Long term unemployed classification accounted for 5%. Students accounted for 39% of moves into Middlesbrough but for the Tees Valley as a whole it was 13%.
- 6.8 Moves **OUT** of the Tees Valley were altogether more consistent between districts by socio-economic classification (See Table D2). Professional/Managerial and Intermediate classifications again accounted for around half of all moves but this time the range was only 45% (Redcar & Cleveland) to 53% (Darlington). Lower supervisory, Semi-routine and Routine classifications made up between one fifth and one quarter of moves out while the Never worked/Long term unemployed classification accounted for 3% of moves.
- 6.9 The NET flow by classification (see Table D3) shows Middlesbrough losing significant numbers of Professional/Managerial and Intermediate groups whilst gaining Students. Darlington and Hartlepool have net gains in most groups but have a net loss of Students while Redcar & Cleveland and Stockton-on-Tees generally have small net losses over most groups.

## APPENDIX A

**Table A1 : Darlington - Proportions moving WITHIN and INTO the Tees Valley**

WardCode	WardName DESTINATION of Move	Total Moves INTO & WITHIN TV	% Moves WITHIN WARD	% Other Moves WITHIN DISTRICT	% Moves IN From Other Tees Valley	% Moves IN From Adjoining Districts	% Moves IN From Other UK Districts	% Moves IN From Outside UK
00EHNC	Bank Top	453	14%	51%	5%	7%	21%	2%
00EHND	Central	568	13%	53%	1%	7%	21%	5%
00EHNE	Cockerton East	615	21%	69%	0%	2%	6%	1%
00EHNF	Cockerton West	388	28%	52%	2%	5%	13%	2%
00EHNG	College	381	8%	63%	2%	6%	20%	2%
00EHNH	Eastbourne	494	34%	46%	2%	8%	9%	1%
00EHNJ	Faverdale	273	7%	57%	4%	7%	25%	0%
00EHNK	Harrowgate Hill	855	16%	52%	1%	7%	22%	2%
00EHNL	Haughton East	445	13%	61%	3%	5%	14%	3%
00EHNM	Haughton North	269	14%	47%	3%	10%	25%	1%
00EHNH	Haughton West	538	19%	60%	2%	2%	15%	2%
00EHNQ	Heighington and Coniscliffe	226	20%	29%	3%	19%	29%	0%
00EHNQ	Hummersknott	366	13%	50%	7%	7%	23%	1%
00EHNQ	Hurworth	216	26%	31%	4%	6%	32%	1%
00EHNQ	Lascelles	413	17%	61%	2%	1%	15%	3%
00EHNQ	Lingfield	263	12%	64%	3%	2%	14%	5%
00EHNQ	Middleton St George	588	16%	33%	27%	4%	19%	2%
00EHNQ	Mowden	211	10%	55%	4%	6%	21%	3%
00EHNQ	North Road	824	25%	50%	3%	6%	14%	3%
00EHNQ	Northgate	762	12%	47%	3%	7%	25%	5%
00EHNQ	Park East	868	23%	42%	6%	6%	20%	5%
00EHNQ	Park West	269	17%	51%	3%	9%	16%	4%
00EHNQ	Pierremont	626	18%	51%	2%	7%	21%	1%
00EHNQ	Sadberge and Whessoe	160	10%	28%	19%	13%	15%	15%
00EH	Darlington Total	11,071	18%	51%	4%	6%	18%	3%

*Note : Adjoining Districts are Hambleton, Richmondshire and Scarborough in North Yorkshire and Easington and Sedgfield in County Durham.*

*Note : Percentages may not sum to 100% exactly due to rounding.*

**Table A2 : Hartlepool - Proportions moving WITHIN and INTO the Tees Valley**

WardCode	WardName - DESTINATION of Move	Total Moves INTO & WITHIN TV	% Moves WITHIN WARD	% Other Moves WITHIN DISTRICT	% Moves IN From Other Tees Valley	% Moves IN From Adjoining Districts	% Moves IN From Other UK Districts	% Moves IN From Outside UK
00EBMA	Brinkburn	556	21%	61%	3%	0%	12%	4%
00EBMB	Brus	640	27%	53%	2%	4%	10%	4%
00EBMC	Dyke House	801	30%	55%	3%	2%	9%	1%
00EBMD	Elwick	146	12%	43%	12%	8%	21%	3%
00EBME	Fens	466	26%	60%	5%	3%	4%	3%
00EBMF	Grange	576	18%	59%	5%	4%	14%	1%
00EBMG	Greatham	176	22%	63%	0%	7%	7%	2%
00EBMH	Hart	479	30%	45%	7%	8%	9%	2%
00EBMJ	Jackson	1,061	25%	54%	5%	3%	11%	3%
00EBMK	Owton	490	41%	47%	1%	3%	7%	2%
00EBML	Park	495	17%	58%	6%	2%	15%	2%
00EBMM	Rift House	413	16%	69%	3%	4%	7%	1%
00EBMN	Rossmere	490	26%	61%	3%	2%	8%	1%
00EBMP	St. Hilda	716	49%	32%	3%	5%	9%	3%
00EBMQ	Seaton	636	28%	54%	7%	1%	8%	0%
00EBMR	Stranton	801	26%	58%	3%	3%	9%	1%
00EBMS	Throston	795	19%	59%	3%	6%	11%	2%
00EB	Hartlepool Total	9,737	26%	55%	4%	3%	10%	2%

*Note : Adjoining Districts are Hambleton, Richmondshire and Scarborough in North Yorkshire and Easington and Sedgfield in County Durham.*

*Note : Percentages may not sum to 100% exactly due to rounding.*

**Table A3 : Middlesbrough - Proportions moving WITHIN and INTO the Tees Valley**

WardCode	WardName DESTINATION of Move	Total Moves INTO & WITHIN TV	% Moves WITHIN WARD	% Other Moves WITHIN DISTRICT	% Moves IN From Other Tees Valley	% Moves IN From Adjoining Districts	% Moves IN From Other UK Districts	% Moves IN From Outside UK
00ECNC	Acklam	375	15%	55%	8%	0%	18%	4%
00ECND	Ayresome	599	33%	51%	8%	1%	5%	3%
00ECNE	Beckfield	467	20%	46%	24%	1%	8%	1%
00ECNF	Beechwood	599	27%	47%	7%	1%	15%	4%
00ECNG	Brookfield	394	17%	54%	14%	3%	11%	1%
00ECNH	Clairville	627	24%	49%	17%	4%	5%	0%
00ECNJ	Coulby Newham	831	25%	41%	14%	4%	14%	2%
00ECNK	Gresham	1,865	24%	39%	9%	2%	18%	7%
00ECNL	Hemlington	662	32%	42%	13%	0%	12%	1%
00ECNM	Kader	338	7%	62%	12%	2%	12%	5%
00ECNN	Ladgate	407	25%	48%	13%	2%	10%	2%
00ECNP	Linthorpe	675	16%	59%	11%	2%	12%	1%
00ECNQ	North Ormesby and Brambles Farm	718	34%	45%	14%	1%	4%	1%
00ECNR	Marton	360	19%	42%	15%	5%	18%	2%
00ECNS	Marton West	386	12%	45%	16%	5%	16%	5%
00ECNT	Middlehaven	865	19%	40%	9%	3%	22%	6%
00ECNU	Nunthorpe	289	12%	43%	23%	6%	15%	2%
00ECNW	Pallister	516	32%	54%	9%	3%	2%	0%
00ECNX	Park	656	15%	58%	15%	0%	11%	1%
00ECNY	Park End	510	38%	42%	11%	1%	8%	1%
00ECNZ	Stainton and Thornton	262	13%	53%	18%	3%	8%	3%
00ECPA	Thorntree	523	36%	48%	10%	0%	4%	2%
00ECPB	University	1,316	22%	35%	5%	3%	30%	6%
00EC	Middlesbrough Total	14,240	24%	46%	12%	2%	14%	3%

*Note : Adjoining Districts are Hambleton, Richmondshire and Scarborough in North Yorkshire and Easington and Sedgfield in County Durham.*

*Note : Percentages may not sum to 100% exactly due to rounding.*

**Table A4 : Redcar & Cleveland - Proportions moving WITHIN and INTO the Tees Valley**

WardCode	WardName DESTINATION of Move	Total Moves INTO & WITHIN TV	% Moves WITHIN WARD	% Other Moves WITHIN DISTRICT	% Moves IN From Other Tees Valley	% Moves IN From Adjoining Districts	% Moves IN From Other UK Districts	% Moves IN From Outside UK
00EEMZ	Brotton	600	51%	30%	5%	5%	10%	0%
00EENA	Coatham	609	21%	57%	9%	1%	8%	3%
00EENB	Dormanstown	596	30%	50%	12%	1%	6%	2%
00EENC	Eston	744	25%	51%	13%	2%	9%	0%
00EEND	Grangetown	687	46%	23%	13%	1%	8%	9%
00EENE	Guisborough	748	34%	43%	9%	2%	10%	3%
00EENF	Hutton	497	26%	43%	11%	2%	16%	2%
00EENG	Kirkleatham	642	29%	42%	10%	0%	12%	8%
00EENH	Lockwood	130	45%	44%	2%	0%	7%	2%
00EENJ	Loftus	636	53%	27%	4%	6%	8%	0%
00EENK	Longbeck	427	18%	61%	11%	0%	8%	3%
00EENL	Newcomen	431	14%	58%	6%	0%	13%	9%
00EENM	Normanby	492	18%	52%	19%	0%	9%	2%
00EENN	Ormesby	460	18%	21%	43%	1%	10%	6%
00EENP	St Germain's	381	25%	47%	10%	2%	13%	3%
00EENQ	Saltburn	702	42%	32%	8%	2%	14%	3%
00EENR	Skelton	651	37%	40%	6%	5%	12%	1%
00EENS	South Bank	758	45%	29%	12%	2%	6%	5%
00EENT	Teesville	507	22%	60%	13%	0%	4%	1%
00EENU	West Dyke	824	21%	59%	9%	1%	9%	1%
00EENW	Westworth	291	23%	47%	9%	1%	19%	1%
00EENX	Zetland	383	14%	61%	8%	2%	14%	2%
00EE	Redcar & Cleveland Total	12,196	31%	43%	11%	2%	10%	3%

*Note : Adjoining Districts are Hambleton, Richmondshire and Scarborough in North Yorkshire and Easington and Sedgfield in County Durham.*

*Note : Percentages may not sum to 100% exactly due to rounding.*

**Table A5 : Stockton-on-Tees - Proportions moving WITHIN and INTO the Tees Valley**

WardCode	WardName - DESTINATION of Move	Total Moves INTO & WITHIN TV	% Moves WITHIN WARD	% Other Moves WITHIN DISTRICT	% Moves IN From Other Tees Valley	% Moves IN From Adjoining Districts	% Moves IN From Other UK Districts	% Moves IN From Outside UK
00EFMA	Bishopsgarth	515	23%	54%	6%	2%	12%	1%
00EFMB	Blue Hall	609	21%	55%	9%	1%	12%	1%
00EFMC	Charltons	448	32%	51%	4%	1%	9%	3%
00EFMD	Egglescliffe	666	26%	36%	10%	7%	17%	3%
00EFME	Elm Tree	286	9%	64%	12%	2%	9%	3%
00EFMF	Fairfield	354	15%	66%	1%	4%	9%	5%
00EFMG	Glebe	516	28%	48%	10%	1%	10%	2%
00EFMH	Grange	317	16%	62%	9%	2%	12%	0%
00EFMJ	Grangefield	498	17%	59%	6%	2%	13%	3%
00EFMK	Hardwick	591	28%	48%	12%	0%	9%	3%
00EFML	Hartburn	407	15%	57%	6%	1%	18%	2%
00EFMM	Ingleby Barwick	2,447	25%	23%	27%	4%	18%	3%
00EFMN	Mandale	529	23%	60%	5%	2%	9%	1%
00EFMP	Marsh House	580	26%	49%	11%	1%	11%	2%
00EFMQ	Mile House	480	22%	61%	6%	2%	6%	3%
00EFMR	Newtown	613	30%	49%	8%	1%	10%	2%
00EFMS	Northfield	234	9%	59%	8%	1%	15%	8%
00EFMT	Norton	1,068	8%	31%	26%	7%	24%	3%
00EFMU	Parkfield	1,081	24%	45%	9%	2%	14%	6%
00EFMW	Portrack and Tilery	630	22%	59%	10%	1%	6%	2%
00EFMX	Preston	318	14%	48%	6%	2%	25%	5%
00EFMY	Roseworth	485	15%	66%	5%	1%	12%	1%
00EFMZ	St. Aidan's	306	23%	63%	6%	1%	5%	2%
00EFNA	St. Cuthbert's	454	27%	58%	6%	1%	6%	2%
00EFNB	Stainsby	547	30%	53%	8%	2%	7%	1%
00EFNC	Victoria	944	37%	37%	9%	3%	11%	3%
00EFND	Village	457	18%	68%	6%	1%	7%	1%
00EFNE	Whitton	532	11%	36%	16%	9%	23%	5%
00EFNF	Wolviston	384	18%	61%	9%	3%	5%	4%
00EFNG	Yarm	784	30%	27%	11%	7%	21%	3%
00EF	Stockton-on-Tees Total	18,080	23%	46%	12%	3%	13%	3%

*Note : Adjoining Districts are Hambleton, Richmondshire and Scarborough in North Yorkshire and Easington and Sedgfield in County Durham.*

*Note : Percentages may not sum to 100% exactly due to rounding..*

## APPENDIX B

**Table B1 : Darlington - Proportions moving WITHIN and OUT of Tees Valley.**

WardCode	WardName - ORIGIN of Move	Total Moves OUT of & WITHIN TV	% Moves WITHIN WARD	% Other Moves WITHIN DISTRICT	% Moves TO Other Tees Valley Districts	% Moves OUT To ADJOINING DISTRICTS	% Other Moves To OUTSIDE TV
00EHNC	Bank Top	438	14%	62%	5%	2%	17%
00EHND	Central	553	13%	56%	4%	4%	23%
00EHNE	Cockerton East	504	25%	46%	2%	4%	22%
00EHNF	Cockerton West	459	23%	58%	3%	3%	13%
00EHNG	College	322	10%	47%	3%	8%	32%
00EHNH	Eastbourne	722	24%	57%	2%	5%	13%
00EHNJ	Faverdale	204	9%	51%	1%	12%	27%
00EHNK	Harrowgate Hill	592	23%	49%	5%	6%	17%
00EHNL	Haughton East	440	13%	49%	7%	5%	26%
00EHNM	Haughton North	378	10%	53%	7%	6%	24%
00EHNN	Haughton West	486	21%	59%	2%	4%	13%
00EHNP	Heighington and Coniscliffe	255	18%	22%	1%	25%	34%
00EHNQ	Hummersknott	284	16%	40%	2%	2%	39%
00EHNR	Hurworth	288	20%	37%	3%	14%	26%
00EHNS	Lascelles	398	18%	65%	2%	0%	16%
00EHNT	Lingfield	313	10%	68%	6%	7%	10%
00EHNU	Middleton St George	314	31%	20%	13%	9%	27%
00EHNW	Mowden	237	9%	59%	1%	6%	24%
00EHNX	North Road	885	23%	57%	3%	5%	12%
00EHNY	Northgate	760	13%	58%	4%	4%	22%
00EHNZ	Park East	769	25%	48%	2%	5%	18%
00EHPA	Park West	228	20%	52%	3%	8%	18%
00EHPB	Pierremont	736	15%	60%	2%	2%	21%
00EHPC	Sadberge and Whessoe	186	9%	29%	11%	23%	28%
00EH	Darlington Total	10,751	18%	52%	4%	6%	20%

*Note : Adjoining Districts are Hambleton, Richmondshire and Scarborough in North Yorkshire and Easington and Sedgfield in County Durham.*

*Note : Excludes moves to Outside UK.*

*Note : Percentages may not sum to 100% exactly due to rounding.*

**Table B2 : Hartlepool – Proportions moving WITHIN and OUT of Tees Valley.**

WardCode	WardName - ORIGIN of Move	Total Moves OUT of & WITHIN TV	% Moves WITHIN WARD	% Other Moves WITHIN DISTRICT	% Moves TO Other Tees Valley Districts	% Moves OUT To ADJOINING DISTRICTS	% Other Moves To OUTSIDE TV
00EBMA	Brinkburn	597	19%	68%	6%	2%	6%
00EBMB	Brus	474	36%	42%	3%	3%	16%
00EBMC	Dyke House	853	28%	55%	7%	4%	6%
00EBMD	Elwick	125	14%	34%	14%	14%	23%
00EBME	Fens	536	23%	65%	2%	2%	8%
00EBMF	Grange	645	16%	51%	5%	3%	25%
00EBMG	Greatham	189	20%	59%	3%	3%	14%
00EBMH	Hart	524	27%	45%	8%	5%	15%
00EBMJ	Jackson	1,018	26%	58%	5%	2%	10%
00EBMK	Owton	597	34%	53%	6%	1%	7%
00EBML	Park	385	21%	55%	5%	2%	16%
00EBMM	Rift House	445	15%	67%	3%	4%	11%
00EBMN	Rossmere	457	28%	54%	4%	3%	11%
00EBMP	St. Hilda	960	37%	49%	4%	2%	9%
00EBMQ	Seaton	502	36%	41%	4%	3%	17%
00EBMR	Stranton	888	24%	60%	4%	3%	9%
00EBMS	Throston	611	24%	49%	4%	6%	16%
00EB	Hartlepool Total	9,806	26%	54%	5%	3%	12%

*Note : Adjoining Districts are Hambleton, Richmondshire and Scarborough in North Yorkshire and Easington and Sedgfield in County Durham.*

*Note : Excludes moves to Outside UK.*

*Note : Percentages may not sum to 100% exactly due to rounding.*

**Table B3 : Middlesbrough - Proportions moving WITHIN and OUT of Tees Valley.**

WardCode	WardName - ORIGIN of Move	Total Moves OUT of & WITHIN TV	% Moves WITHIN WARD	% Other Moves WITHIN DISTRICT	% Moves TO Other Tees Valley Districts	% Moves OUT To ADJOINING DISTRICTS	% Other Moves To OUTSIDE TV
00ECNC	Acklam	353	16%	34%	22%	5%	23%
00ECND	Ayresome	779	26%	47%	17%	1%	10%
00ECNE	Beckfield	378	25%	40%	26%	2%	7%
00ECNF	Beechwood	587	27%	36%	20%	3%	14%
00ECNG	Brookfield	402	16%	39%	25%	3%	16%
00ECNH	Clairville	568	26%	42%	18%	2%	12%
00ECNJ	Coulby Newham	818	26%	38%	17%	6%	13%
00ECNK	Gresham	1,890	24%	43%	8%	1%	24%
00ECNL	Hemlington	702	30%	40%	18%	2%	11%
00ECNM	Kader	336	7%	46%	19%	3%	26%
00ECNN	Ladgate	407	25%	33%	24%	4%	14%
00ECNP	Linthorpe	867	13%	46%	15%	4%	22%
00ECNQ	North Ormesby and Brambles Farm	848	29%	49%	14%	0%	8%
00ECNR	Marton	400	17%	36%	16%	4%	28%
00ECNS	Marton West	374	13%	30%	26%	7%	24%
00ECNT	Middlehaven	914	18%	51%	9%	1%	20%
00ECNU	Nunthorpe	403	8%	30%	29%	10%	23%
00ECNW	Pallister	561	29%	49%	13%	1%	7%
00ECNX	Park	674	15%	48%	13%	1%	23%
00ECNY	Park End	546	36%	48%	13%	1%	3%
00ECNZ	Stainton and Thornton	238	15%	45%	18%	6%	17%
00ECPA	Thorntree	676	28%	47%	16%	1%	8%
00ECPB	University	1,278	22%	49%	8%	1%	20%
00EC	Middlesbrough Total	14,999	22%	43%	15%	2%	17%

*Note : Adjoining Districts are Hambleton, Richmondshire and Scarborough in North Yorkshire and Easington and Sedgfield in County Durham.*

*Note : Excludes moves to Outside UK.*

*Note : Percentages may not sum to 100% exactly due to rounding.*

**Table B4 : Redcar & Cleveland - Proportions moving WITHIN and OUT of Tees Valley.**

WardCode	WardName - ORIGIN of Move	Total Moves OUT of & WITHIN TV	% Moves WITHIN WARD	% Other Moves WITHIN DISTRICT	% Moves TO Other Tees Valley Districts	% Moves OUT To ADJOINING DISTRICTS	% Other Moves To OUTSIDE TV
00EEMZ	Brotton	712	43%	42%	1%	2%	12%
00EENA	Coatham	624	21%	56%	9%	1%	13%
00EENB	Dormanstown	605	29%	49%	6%	1%	14%
00EENC	Eston	621	30%	41%	19%	1%	10%
00EEND	Grangetown	705	45%	39%	10%	2%	4%
00EENE	Guisborough	686	37%	38%	10%	5%	11%
00EENF	Hutton	657	19%	37%	12%	3%	29%
00EENG	Kirkleatham	834	22%	57%	10%	4%	7%
00EENH	Lockwood	187	31%	47%	5%	5%	13%
00EENJ	Loftus	682	50%	29%	4%	4%	13%
00EENK	Longbeck	472	16%	36%	10%	3%	36%
00EENL	Newcomen	494	13%	68%	6%	1%	12%
00EENM	Normanby	524	17%	42%	28%	5%	9%
00EENN	Ormesby	473	18%	24%	45%	4%	9%
00EENP	St Germain's	386	24%	42%	6%	4%	24%
00EENQ	Saltburn	642	46%	26%	5%	1%	23%
00EENR	Skelton	634	38%	32%	9%	3%	17%
00EENS	South Bank	861	40%	33%	16%	2%	10%
00EENT	Teesville	509	22%	52%	15%	0%	11%
00EENU	West Dyke	599	29%	45%	6%	2%	18%
00EENW	Westworth	364	19%	44%	7%	9%	22%
00EENX	Zetland	392	13%	55%	6%	1%	25%
00EE	Redcar & Cleveland Total	12,663	30%	42%	11%	3%	15%

*Note : Adjoining Districts are Hambleton, Richmondshire and Scarborough in North Yorkshire and Easington and Sedgfield in County Durham.*

*Note : Excludes moves to Outside UK.*

*Note : Percentages may not sum to 100% exactly due to rounding.*

**Table B5 : Stockton-on-Tees - Proportions moving WITHIN and OUT of Tees Valley.**

WardCode	WardName - ORIGIN of Move	Total Moves OUT of & WITHIN TV	% Moves WITHIN WARD	% Other Moves WITHIN DISTRICT	% Moves TO Other Tees Valley Districts	% Moves OUT To ADJOINING DISTRICTS	% Other Moves To OUTSIDE TV
00EFMA	Bishopsgarth	573	21%	55%	7%	0%	16%
00EFMB	Blue Hall	634	21%	56%	7%	4%	12%
00EFMC	Charltons	595	24%	54%	8%	3%	11%
00EFMD	Egglescliffe	664	27%	30%	10%	5%	29%
00EFME	Elm Tree	294	9%	62%	12%	4%	12%
00EFMF	Fairfield	358	15%	49%	9%	1%	26%
00EFMG	Glebe	442	33%	46%	5%	2%	14%
00EFMH	Grange	337	15%	67%	6%	0%	12%
00EFMJ	Grangefield	481	17%	57%	3%	5%	18%
00EFMK	Hardwick	646	26%	55%	7%	0%	12%
00EFML	Hartburn	511	12%	51%	11%	0%	25%
00EFMM	Ingleby Barwick	1,503	40%	18%	14%	4%	23%
00EFMN	Mandale	678	18%	56%	8%	4%	13%
00EFMP	Marsh House	621	24%	51%	7%	1%	17%
00EFMQ	Mile House	397	26%	56%	5%	2%	10%
00EFMR	Newtown	771	24%	62%	7%	0%	8%
00EFMS	Northfield	290	8%	56%	4%	1%	31%
00EFMT	Norton	672	13%	48%	8%	5%	26%
00EFMU	Parkfield	940	28%	50%	9%	1%	12%
00EFMW	Portrack and Tilery	659	21%	59%	9%	4%	8%
00EFMX	Preston	303	15%	42%	8%	3%	33%
00EFMY	Roseworth	434	17%	61%	7%	3%	12%
00EFMZ	St. Aidan's	411	17%	64%	8%	2%	9%
00EFNA	St. Cuthbert's	436	28%	51%	6%	1%	15%
00EFNB	Stainsby	579	28%	55%	8%	2%	6%
00EFNC	Victoria	1,143	31%	45%	7%	2%	15%
00EFND	Village	425	19%	61%	7%	3%	10%
00EFNE	Whitton	357	16%	28%	13%	7%	36%
00EFNF	Wolviston	322	21%	42%	8%	3%	25%
00EFNG	Yarm	857	28%	31%	9%	6%	26%
00EF	Stockton-on-Tees Total	17,333	24%	48%	8%	3%	17%

*Note : Adjoining Districts are Hambleton, Richmondshire and Scarborough in North Yorkshire and Easington and Sedgfield in County Durham.*

*Note : Excludes moves to Outside UK.*

*Note : Percentages may not sum to 100% exactly due to rounding.*

## APPENDIX C

**Table C1 : Tees Valley Districts- Proportions moving INTO Tees Valley from Outside the UK by Economic Activity**

DistCode	District Name - DESTINATION of Move	Total Moves FROM Outside UK	Total Moves FROM Outside UK Ages 16-74	All Students (16-74)	Economically Active (16-74) (Excl. Econ Act Students)	Economically Inactive (16-74) (Excl. All Students)
00EH	Darlington Total	296	234	10%	73%	17%
00EB	Hartlepool Total	186	159	6%	64%	30%
00EC	Middlesbrough Total	468	364	42%	33%	25%
00EE	Redcar & Cleveland Total	368	258	7%	41%	52%
00EF	Stockton-on-Tees Total	507	414	7%	63%	30%
TV	Tees Valley Total	1,825	1,429	16%	53%	31%

*Source : SMS Table 105, 2001 Census ONS Crown Copyright.*

## APPENDIX D

**Table D1 : Tees Valley Districts- Moves INTO the Tees Valley by Socio-Economic Classification of Group Reference Person (GRF).**

DistCode	District Name - DESTINATION of Move	Total Migrant Groups (16-74)	Professional / Managerial	Intermediate	Lower Supervisory / Technical	Semi-Routine	Routine	Never worked / Long term Unemployed	Full Time Students	Not Classified
00EH	Darlington	1,647	40%	15%	6%	12%	8%	3%	4%	11%
00EB	Hartlepool	850	36%	11%	9%	11%	8%	5%	6%	14%
00EC	Middlesbrough	1,341	18%	9%	3%	9%	8%	7%	39%	8%
00EE	Redcar & Cleveland	924	31%	13%	9%	10%	9%	6%	7%	15%
00EF	Stockton-on-Tees	1,712	38%	15%	7%	9%	6%	6%	9%	10%
TV	Tees Valley	6,474	33%	13%	7%	10%	8%	5%	13%	11%

Source : SMS Table 109, 2001 Census ONS Crown Copyright. Wholly moving Households or

Note : Flows in EXCLUDE migrants with "No Previous Address"

Note: Excludes WITHIN Tees Valley moves.

Note : Group Reference Person (GRF) is either the household reference person of a wholly moving household or head of a group – both are determined by economic status, then age, then order on the census form.

**Table D2 : Tees Valley Districts- Moves OUT of the Tees Valley by Socio-Economic Classification of Group Reference Person.**

DistCode	District Name ORIGIN of Move	Total Migrants Groups (16-74)	Professional / Managerial	Intermediate	Lower Supervisory / Technical	Semi-Routine	Routine	Never worked / Long term Unemployed	Full Time Students	Not Classified
00EH	Darlington	1,504	39%	14%	6%	9%	6%	2%	13%	10%
00EB	Hartlepool Total	704	34%	13%	8%	12%	5%	5%	10%	14%
00EC	Middlesbrough	1,773	35%	14%	6%	11%	6%	4%	16%	7%
00EE	Redcar & Cleveland	1,100	35%	10%	8%	8%	8%	1%	16%	14%
00EF	Stockton-on-Tees	1,892	38%	14%	6%	9%	5%	4%	16%	8%
TV	Tees Valley	6,973	37%	13%	6%	10%	6%	3%	15%	10%

Source : SMS Table 109, 2001 Census ONS Crown Copyright.

Note: Excludes WITHIN Tees Valley moves.

Note : Group Reference Person (GRF) is either the household reference person of a wholly moving household or head of a group – both are determined by economic status, then age, then order on the census form.

**Table D3 : Tees Valley Districts- Net Moves to/from the Tees Valley by Socio-Economic Classification of Group Reference Person.**

DistCode	District Name NET FLOW	Total Migrants Groups (16-74)	Professional / Managerial	Intermediate	Lower Supervisory / Technical	Semi-Routine	Routine	Never worked / Long term Unemployed	Full Time Students	Not Classified
00EH	Darlington Total	143	64	40	11	75	41	18	-122	16
00EB	Hartlepool Total	146	69	-1	23	9	32	13	-23	24
00EC	Middlesbrough Total	-432	-379	-127	-64	-83	-9	24	228	-22
00EE	Redcar & Cleveland Total	-176	-91	7	1	3	-3	41	-115	-19
00EF	Stockton-on-Tees Total	-180	-64	-9	6	-11	15	34	-160	9
TV	Tees Valley Total	-499	-401	-90	-23	-7	76	130	-192	8

Source : SMS Table 109, 2001 Census ONS Crown Copyright.

Note : Flows in EXCLUDE migrants with "No Previous Address"

Note: Excludes WITHIN Tees Valley moves.

Note : Group Reference Person (GRF) is either the household reference person of a wholly moving household or head of a group – both are determined by economic status, then age, then order on the census form.

**Table D4 : Tees Valley Districts- Socio-Economic Classification of Household Reference Person (HRP).**

DistCode	District Name	All HRPs (16-74)	Professional / Managerial	Intermediate	Lower Supervisory / Technical	Semi-Routine	Routine	Never worked / Long term Unemployed	Full Time Students	Not Classified
00EH	Darlington	37,229	28%	14%	10%	12%	11%	2%	2%	0%
00EB	Hartlepool Total	33,348	20%	11%	11%	12%	13%	3%	2%	1%
00EC	Middlesbrough	49,329	20%	11%	10%	12%	13%	4%	3%	2%
00EE	Redcar & Cleveland	50,640	22%	11%	12%	11%	12%	3%	2%	1%
00EF	Stockton-on-Tees	65,807	27%	12%	11%	10%	11%	2%	2%	1%
TV	Tees Valley	236,353	24%	12%	11%	11%	12%	3%	2%	1%
NE	North East	942,937	24%	13%	10%	11%	12%	2%	2%	1%
England	England	18,087,713	32%	16%	8%	10%	9%	2%	1%	1%

Source : Standard Table ST044, 2001 Census ONS Crown Copyright. Figures may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Note : Household Reference Person (HRF) is determined by economic status, then age, then order on the census form.