

# Appendix B: Methodology note: exclusion of Conservation Aggregates from selected analyses due to lack of reliably matched Comparator Aggregate

---

A central component of this research is the development of matched Comparator Aggregates against which to compare changes observed over time in the respective Conservation Aggregates.

The objective at the outset of the project was to construct a matched Comparator Aggregate for every Conservation Aggregate in the country. Comparator Aggregates were constructed in such a way as to be as similar as possible to the Conservation Aggregate on two key measures: (i) the total population as at mid-2005; and (ii) the level of multiple deprivation based upon the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2007 (which had a primary data time point of 2005)<sup>1</sup>.

For the vast majority of Conservation Aggregates, it was possible to construct a matched Comparator Aggregate that was very similar in terms of both population size and deprivation level. However, for a minority of Conservation Aggregates the matched Comparator Aggregate was deemed unsatisfactory in terms of either the population size or the deprivation level, or indeed both. In cases where the Comparator Aggregate was not well matched to the respective Conservation Aggregate it is inappropriate to benchmark the change over time observed in the Conservation Aggregate against that observed in the Comparator Aggregate.

The decision as to what constitute a good match between the Conservation Aggregate and the Comparator Aggregate is necessarily subjective and based on researcher judgement. The approach adopted in this project is to regard a Comparator Aggregate as well-matched if its population size is within 1.5 times greater or less than the Conservation Aggregate, and the population weighted IMD 2007 score is within 1.5 times greater or less than the Conservation Aggregate<sup>2</sup>. If either of these two rules is violated, the Comparator Aggregate is regarded as an unreliable benchmark.

In cases where the Comparator Aggregate is not well-matched to the respective Conservation Aggregate, the Conservation Aggregate is excluded from the analysis of 'change over time in the Conservation Aggregate relative to the matched Comparator Aggregate'. The Conservation Aggregates are included in all other analyses except where change is measured relative to the matched Comparator Aggregate.

The table below identifies the Conservation Aggregates excluded from our analysis of 'change over time in the Conservation Aggregate relative to the matched Comparator Aggregate':

---

<sup>1</sup> Appendix M shows the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2007 Scores for Conservation Aggregates by typology category

<sup>2</sup> In other words, the ratio of Conservation Aggregate : Comparator Aggregate is between 0.67 and 1.5.

Rural	East Hertfordshire St Albans Welwyn Hatfield
Urban Residential	Westminster
Town Centre	Allerdale Bath and North East Somerset Breckland Brighton and Hove Bristol, City of Cambridge Cheltenham Cornwall Dacorum East Cambridgeshire East Lindsey East Riding of Yorkshire Exeter Fenland Forest Heath Gloucester Harrogate Hastings Huntingdonshire Islington Kensington and Chelsea Leeds Lincoln North Devon North Hertfordshire Northumberland Norwich Oxford Richmond upon Thames South Cambridgeshire South Holland South Lakeland South Norfolk South Ribble St Albans Stevenage Suffolk Coastal Torbay Tunbridge Wells Wandsworth Warwick Welwyn Hatfield West Berkshire West Oxfordshire Westminster Wiltshire York