

The Salford Budget Matrix 2002/3

- A Step-by-Step Guide -

Introduction

This paper seeks to set out the various stages in the development of a 'Budget Matrix' for Salford. In simple terms a budget matrix is a table that converts locally generated priorities and ideas into financial allocations, with which delivery agencies can engage in developing their strategies. In reality it is a series of tables that all work together in order to produce financial allocations. This paper works through each table and considers the different assumptions or decisions required within each.

The stages can be summarised as follows:

- Stage 1 – Identifying a pot for investment
- Stage 2 - Developing local priorities and ideas
- Stage 3 – Transforming local priorities into city-wide priorities
- Stage 4 – Making adjustments for population
- Stage 5 – Making adjustments for deprivation
- Stage 6 – Weighting the budget matrix
- Stage 7 – Deriving thematic allocations
- Stage 8 – Deriving city-wide allocations

Stage 1 – Identifying a pot for investment

The budget matrix focuses upon an identifiable pot of money for investment. This could be a particular regeneration pot, such as the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund, or it could be the combination of a number of investment pots, perhaps small proportions of different departmental budgets. For the purposes of this study Table 1 (page 3) sets out a hypothetical investment pot of £1 million.

Assumption 1a – A hypothetical investment pot of £1 million.

Stage 2 - Developing local priorities and ideas

The budget matrix table is driven by the generation of local priorities and the development of local (project) ideas. Normally, local community groups would be asked to rank different themes against each other in order of their perceived importance in their local community at the same time identifying particular projects or issues which need to be addressed. Such information is gathered and collated by some form of neighbourhood forum and then fed through into the wider city-wide process. For the purposes of this study we have made the following assumptions:

Assumption 2a – That local areas are defined by Salford’s 9 ‘service delivery area’ boundaries.

Assumption 2b – That ‘themes’ match the 7 themes set out in the Salford Community Plan document.

Assumption 2c – That local priorities are derived from the short descriptions of each area included in Salford’s Community Plan document.

Assumption 2d – That local priorities are ranked from 5 (highest) to 1 (lowest) meaning that 2 themes receive no score or priority in each area.

It would be possible to refine the development of local priorities in a number of ways:

- By using wards as the basic ‘unit’ for the generation of local priorities and for the development of financial allocations.
- By integrating ward-level priorities into a more sophisticated budget matrix table based upon the 9 service delivery areas.
- By generating local priorities through more in-depth consideration of Community Action Plans or more proactive engagement with community committees and the local community more generally. This would also allow for the gathering of project ideas which is another key element to any participatory budgeting process.

Based on the assumptions above Table 1 (overleaf) sets out the relative priorities given to different themes in each community committee area using a ‘scoring’ system (5 being the highest priority, 1 the lowest).

Stage 3 – Transforming local priorities into city-wide priorities

By adding the ‘scores’ in each area it is possible to generate a measure of city-wide priority. By calculating each theme’s percentage of the total score it is possible to allocate the total investment pot across each theme accordingly so generating an initial financial allocation to each theme. It is also possible then to rank city-wide priorities (7 being the highest priority, 1 the lowest).

Assumption 3a – That city-wide priorities are generated by simple addition of local priority scores.

Assumption 3b – That city-wide priorities are ranked from 7 (highest) to 1 (lowest) to ensure that each theme has a rank.

Table 1 (overleaf) sets out each theme’s percentage of the total score together with its concomitant proportion of the total investment budget. It also ranks city-wide priorities showing ‘Valuing Children & Young People’ to be the highest priority in the city.

Table 1: Local and city-wide priorities

Themes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
			<u>A Learning and Creative City</u>	<u>Valuing Children and Young People</u>	<u>Inclusive city, with strong communities</u>	<u>Economic prosperity</u>	<u>Environment and housing</u>	
<u>Areas</u>	<u>A Healthy City</u>	<u>A Safe City</u>						
1 Broughton and Blackfriars	3	4	1	2	5	1		
2 Claremont, Weaste and Seedley		4	1	5	3		2	
3 Eccles, Winton, Barton	1			4	2	5	3	
4 Irlam and Cadishead	3	4	1	2	5			
5 Kersal, Pendleton and Charlestown	2		1		5	4	3	
6 Little Hulton and Walkden		2	3	5	1		4	
7 Ordsall and Langworthy		3	1	2		4	5	
8 Swinton N&S, Pendlebury		4		5			3	
9 Worsley and Boothstown		3		2		4	5	
city wide total	9	24	8	27	21	18	25	132
Percentage *	6.82%	18.18%	6.06%	20.45%	15.91%	13.64%	18.94%	100.00%
Resource = £1,000,000								
Expenditure per theme	£68,182	£181,818	£60,606	£204,545	£159,091	£136,364	£189,394	£1,000,000
city wide score for each theme**	2	5	1	7	4	3	6	28

Note:

* Percentages have been rounded to 2 decimal places

**city wide score for each theme (based on ranking 7 - 1) means highest priority in city gets 7 points, next highest gets 6 points etc)

It cannot be assumed that all areas of the city have 'equal' needs. Some areas have a greater population than others and in a progressive society it is widely understood that there is a need to reduce the gap between those areas that might be considered more deprived than others. For this reason the budget matrix process enables adjustments to be made to address these factors. Stages 4-6 identify a process for making such adjustments.

Stage 4 – Making Adjustments for Population

When developing Salford's budget matrix the 2001 Census statistics were unavailable and so calculations have been made according to 1998 statistics (see Appendix 1). Ward data was aggregated for each community committee area and then calculated as a percentage of the total population. A scoring system was then developed according to the relative proportions of the population living in each area (5 – highest proportion, 1 – lowest proportion).

Assumption 4a – That 1998 statistics are used until 2001 Census statistics become available.

Assumption 4b – That scores are attributed according to 5% 'blocks' of population.

Table 2 below sets out the results of these population calculations.

Table 2: Population adjustments based on 1998 statistics, aggregated by ward

	Estimated population (1998)	Percentage of city population	Percentage of Population score for area	scoring list	percentage of population
Broughton and Blackfriars	18,700	8%	2	1	less than 5%
Claremont, Weaste and Seedley	23,000	10%	3	2	less than 10%
Eccles, Winton, Barton	35,500	16%	4	3	less than 15%
Irlam and Cadishead	18,800	8%	2	4	less than 20%
Kersal, Pendleton and Charlestown	22,400	10%	3	5	less than 25%
Little Hulton and Walkden	38,300	17%	4		
Ordsall and Langworthy	17,300	8%	2		
Swinton N&S, Pendlebury	38,400	17%	4		
Worsley and Boothstown	13,600	6%	2		
Total	226,000	100%			

Stage 5 – Making Adjustments for Deprivation

When developing Salford's budget matrix we decided to use the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2000 (IMD2000). Whilst this has its imperfections (eg. no data around crime) it is probably the most coherent and up to date measure of deprivation. (see Appendix 2). Ward data was aggregated and then calculated as an average for each community committee area. A scoring system was then developed according to the ranking of the area with respect to the rest of the country (8414 wards) expressed as a percentage (5 – highest level of relative deprivation, 1 – lowest level of relative deprivation).

It is possible to build a more sophisticated budget matrix using measure of deprivation specific to each theme. For example, using educational measures with respect to the Children & Young People theme; crime statistics with respect to the Safer Community theme. At this stage it is considered that it is more important to develop a less complicated budget matrix.

Assumption 5a – That the IMD 2000 be used as a relative measure of deprivation.

Assumption 5b – That scores are attributed according to 5% 'blocks' of deprivation.

Table 3 below sets out the results of these population calculations.

Table 3: Deprivation adjustments based on IMD ranking per ward

Total number of wards 8414

Area	IMD rankings	Adjusted IMD	Percentage (x/8414)	Adjusted score
1 Broughton and Blackfriars	126+156	141	2%	5
2 Claremont, Weaste and Seedley	2099+570	1335	16%	2
3 Eccles, Winton, Barton	1551+471 +729	917	11%	3
4 Irlam and Cadishead	1914+1652	1783	21%	1
5 Kersal, Pendleton and Charlestown	1542+201	872	10%	4
6 Little Hulton and Walkden	138+880+3043	1354	16%	2
7 Ordsall and Langworthy	166+260	213	3%	5
8 Swinton N&S, Pendlebury	1608+3009+1030	1882	22%	1
9 Worsley and Boothstown	6108	6108	73%	1

Scoring %	Score
Under 5%	5
Under 10%	4
Under 15%	3
Under 20%	2
above 20%	1

NB: Adjusted IMD above is calculated by adding together ranks of each ward and dividing by number of wards in area (to produce an 'average') This average is turned into a percentage and a score given based on the result.

Stage 6: Weighting the Budget Matrix

One of the most important elements of the budget matrix is its ability to target investments on areas with greater populations or with higher deprivation. This is achieved by attributing relative 'weights' to population and deprivation scores giving a 'multiplier' effect for each area. In this case weighting has been set to prioritise deprivation over population by a ratio of 3.5 to 2.

Assumption 6a: To weight deprivation as more important than population at a ratio of 3.5 to 2.

Table 4 below sets out the impact of the above weightings.

Table 4: Weighting calculations

	Score for 'Population'	Weight	Multiplied total	Score for 'Deprivation'	Weight	Multiplied total
1 Broughton and Blackfriars	2	2	4	5	3.5	17.5
2 Claremont, Weaste and Seedley	3	2	6	2	3.5	7
3 Eccles, Winton, Barton	4	2	8	3	3.5	10.5
4 Irlam and Cadishead	2	2	4	1	3.5	3.5
5 Kersal, Pendleton and Charlestown	3	2	6	4	3.5	14
6 Little Hulton and Walkden	4	2	8	2	3.5	7
7 Ordsall and Langworthy	2	2	4	5	3.5	17.5
8 Swinton N&S, Pendlebury	4	2	8	1	3.5	3.5
9 Worsley and Boothstown	2	2	4	1	3.5	3.5

Population multiplier (weight)	2
--------------------------------	---

Deprivation multiplier (weight)	3.5
---------------------------------	-----

Note:

Adjusting the multiplier targets resources towards deprivation or towards population as agreed

Stage 7 - Deriving Thematic Allocations

Based on the above information gathered and the assumptions made it is possible to make financial allocations for each area and theme. Calculations are made as follows:

- Step 1 Local priorities given for the particular theme are multiplied by city-wide priority given to the theme to give a multiplied total (a locally-adjusted score)
- Step 2 The locally adjusted score is then added to population adjusted scores and deprivation adjusted scores to give a total score for each area
- Step 3 The total score for all areas is then used to convert each area's score into a percentage.
- Step 4 The percentage is then used to allocate the total amount of money allocated to the particular theme across the different areas.

Tables 5 – 11 set out the allocations for each of the 7 themes.

Table 5: A Healthy City

	citywide priority	local priority	Multiplied total
1 Broughton and Blackfriars	2	3	6
2 Claremont, Weaste and Seedley	2	0	0
3 Eccles, Winton, Barton	2	1	2
4 Irlam and Cadishead	2	3	6
5 Kersal, Pendleton and Charlestown	2	2	4
6 Little Hulton and Walkden	2	0	0
7 Ordsall and Langworthy	2	0	0
8 Swinton N&S, Pendlebury	2	0	0
9 Worsley and Boothstown	2	0	0

Resource **£ 68,182**

<u>Area</u>	local adjusted score	population adjusted	deprivation adjusted	sum of previous columns	Percentage	Allocation
1 Broughton and Blackfriars	6	4	17.5	27.5	18%	£ 12,175
2 Claremont, Weaste and Seedley	0	6	7	13	8%	£ 5,756
3 Eccles, Winton, Barton	2	8	10.5	20.5	13%	£ 9,076
4 Irlam and Cadishead	6	4	3.5	13.5	9%	£ 5,977
5 Kersal, Pendleton and Charlestown	4	6	14	24	16%	£ 10,626
6 Little Hulton and Walkden	0	8	7	15	10%	£ 6,641
7 Ordsall and Langworthy	0	4	17.5	21.5	14%	£ 9,519
8 Swinton N&S, Pendlebury	0	8	3.5	11.5	7%	£ 5,091
9 Worsley and Boothstown	0	4	3.5	7.5	5%	£ 3,321
Total				154		£ 68,182

Table 6: A Safe City

	citywide priority	local priority	Multiplied total
1 Broughton and Blackfriars	5	4	20
2 Claremont, Weaste and Seedley	5	0	0
3 Eccles, Winton, Barton	5	1	5
4 Irlam and Cadishead	5	3	15
5 Kersal, Pendleton and Charlestown	5	2	10
6 Little Hulton and Walkden	5	0	0
7 Ordsall and Langworthy	5	0	0
8 Swinton N&S, Pendlebury	5	0	0
9 Worsley and Boothstown	5	0	0

Resource

£ 181,818

<u>Area</u>	local adjusted score	population adjusted	deprivation adjusted	sum of previous columns	Percentage	Allocation
1 Broughton and Blackfriars	20	4	17.5	41.5	22%	£ 40,567
2 Claremont, Weaste and Seedley	0	6	7	13	7%	£ 12,708
3 Eccles, Winton, Barton	5	8	10.5	23.5	13%	£ 22,972
4 Irlam and Cadishead	15	4	3.5	22.5	12%	£ 21,994
5 Kersal, Pendleton and Charlestown	10	6	14	30	16%	£ 29,326
6 Little Hulton and Walkden	0	8	7	15	8%	£ 14,663
7 Ordsall and Langworthy	0	4	17.5	21.5	12%	£ 21,017
8 Swinton N&S, Pendlebury	0	8	3.5	11.5	6%	£ 11,241
9 Worsley and Boothstown	0	4	3.5	7.5	4%	£ 7,331
Total				186		£ 181,818

Table 7: A Learning and Creative City

	citywide priority	local priority	Multiplied total
1 Broughton and Blackfriars	1	1	1
2 Claremont, Weaste and Seedley	1	1	1
3 Eccles, Winton, Barton	1	0	0
4 Irlam and Cadishead	1	1	1
5 Kersal, Pendleton and Charlestown	1	1	1
6 Little Hulton and Walkden	1	3	3
7 Ordsall and Langworthy	1	1	1
8 Swinton N&S, Pendlebury	1	0	0
9 Worsley and Boothstown	1	0	0

Resource

£ 60,606

<u>Area</u>	local adjusted score	population adjusted	deprivation adjusted	sum of previous columns	Percentage	Allocation
1 Broughton and Blackfriars	1	4	17.5	22.5	16%	£ 9,470
2 Claremont, Weaste and Seedley	1	6	7	14	10%	£ 5,892
3 Eccles, Winton, Barton	0	8	10.5	18.5	13%	£ 7,786
4 Irlam and Cadishead	1	4	3.5	8.5	6%	£ 3,577
5 Kersal, Pendleton and Charlestown	1	6	14	21	15%	£ 8,838
6 Little Hulton and Walkden	3	8	7	18	13%	£ 7,576
7 Ordsall and Langworthy	1	4	17.5	22.5	16%	£ 9,470
8 Swinton N&S, Pendlebury	0	8	3.5	11.5	8%	£ 4,840
9 Worsley and Boothstown	0	4	3.5	7.5	5%	£ 3,157
Total				144		£ 60,606

Table 8: Valuing Children and Young People

	citywide priority	local priority	Multiplied total
1 Broughton and Blackfriars	7	2	14
2 Claremont, Weaste and Seedley	7	5	35
3 Eccles, Winton, Barton	7	4	28
4 Irlam and Cadishead	7	2	14
5 Kersal, Pendleton and Charlestown	7	0	0
6 Little Hulton and Walkden	7	5	35
7 Ordsall and Langworthy	7	2	14
8 Swinton N&S, Pendlebury	7	5	35
9 Worsley and Boothstown	7	2	14

Resource

£ 204,545

<u>Area</u>	local adjusted score	population adjusted	deprivation adjusted	sum of previous columns	Percentage	Allocation
1 Broughton and Blackfriars	14	4	17.5	35.5	11%	£ 22,343
2 Claremont, Weaste and Seedley	35	6	7	48	15%	£ 30,210
3 Eccles, Winton, Barton	28	8	10.5	46.5	14%	£ 29,266
4 Irlam and Cadishead	14	4	3.5	21.5	7%	£ 13,531
5 Kersal, Pendleton and Charlestown	0	6	14	20	6%	£ 12,587
6 Little Hulton and Walkden	35	8	7	50	15%	£ 31,469
7 Ordsall and Langworthy	14	4	17.5	35.5	11%	£ 22,343
8 Swinton N&S, Pendlebury	35	8	3.5	46.5	14%	£ 29,266
9 Worsley and Boothstown	14	4	3.5	21.5	7%	£ 13,531
Total				325		£ 204,545

Table 9: Inclusive city, with strong communities

	citywide priority	local priority	Multiplied total
1 Broughton and Blackfriars	4	5	20
2 Claremont, Weaste and Seedley	4	5	20
3 Eccles, Winton, Barton	4	4	16
4 Irlam and Cadishead	4	2	8
5 Kersal, Pendleton and Charlestown	4	0	0
6 Little Hulton and Walkden	4	5	20
7 Ordsall and Langworthy	4	2	8
8 Swinton N&S, Pendlebury	4	5	20
9 Worsley and Boothstown	4	2	8

Resource

£ 159,091

<u>Area</u>	local adjusted score	population adjusted	deprivation adjusted	sum of previous columns	Percentage	Allocation
1 Broughton and Blackfriars	20	4	17.5	41.5	16%	£ 25,790
2 Claremont, Weaste and Seedley	20	6	7	33	13%	£ 20,508
3 Eccles, Winton, Barton	16	8	10.5	34.5	13%	£ 21,440
4 Irlam and Cadishead	8	4	3.5	15.5	6%	£ 9,632
5 Kersal, Pendleton and Charlestown	0	6	14	20	8%	£ 12,429
6 Little Hulton and Walkden	20	8	7	35	14%	£ 21,751
7 Ordsall and Langworthy	8	4	17.5	29.5	12%	£ 18,333
8 Swinton N&S, Pendlebury	20	8	3.5	31.5	12%	£ 19,576
9 Worsley and Boothstown	8	4	3.5	15.5	6%	£ 9,632
Total				256		£ 159,091

Table 10: Economic prosperity

	citywide priority	local priority	Multiplied total
1 Broughton and Blackfriars	3	1	3
2 Claremont, Weaste and Seedley	4	0	0
3 Eccles, Winton, Barton	4	5	20
4 Irlam and Cadishead	4	0	0
5 Kersal, Pendleton and Charlestown	4	4	16
6 Little Hulton and Walkden	4	0	0
7 Ordsall and Langworthy	4	4	16
8 Swinton N&S, Pendlebury	4	0	0
9 Worsley and Boothstown	4	4	16

Resource

£ 136,364

Area	local adjusted score	population adjusted	deprivation adjusted	sum of previous columns	Percentage	Allocation
1 Broughton and Blackfriars	3	4	17.5	24.5	12%	£ 16,140
2 Claremont, Weaste and Seedley	0	6	7	13	6%	£ 8,564
3 Eccles, Winton, Barton	20	8	10.5	38.5	19%	£ 25,362
4 Irlam and Cadishead	0	4	3.5	7.5	4%	£ 4,941
5 Kersal, Pendleton and Charlestown	16	6	14	36	17%	£ 23,715
6 Little Hulton and Walkden	0	8	7	15	7%	£ 9,881
7 Ordsall and Langworthy	16	4	17.5	37.5	18%	£ 24,704
8 Swinton N&S, Pendlebury	0	8	3.5	11.5	6%	£ 7,576
9 Worsley and Boothstown	16	4	3.5	23.5	11%	£ 15,481
Total				207		£ 136,364

Table 11: Environment and Housing

	citywide priority	local priority	Multiplied total
1 Broughton and Blackfriars	6	0	0
2 Claremont, Weaste and Seedley	6	2	12
3 Eccles, Winton, Barton	6	3	18
4 Irlam and Cadishead	6	0	0
5 Kersal, Pendleton and Charlestown	6	3	18
6 Little Hulton and Walkden	6	4	24
7 Ordsall and Langworthy	6	5	30
8 Swinton N&S, Pendlebury	6	3	18
9 Worsley and Boothstown	6	5	30

Resource

£ 189,394

<u>Area</u>	local adjusted score	population adjusted	deprivation adjusted	sum of previous columns	Percentage	Allocation
1 Broughton and Blackfriars	0	4	17.5	21.5	8%	£ 14,238
2 Claremont, Weaste and Seedley	12	6	7	25	9%	£ 16,555
3 Eccles, Winton, Barton	18	8	10.5	36.5	13%	£ 24,171
4 Irlam and Cadishead	0	4	3.5	7.5	3%	£ 4,967
5 Kersal, Pendleton and Charlestown	18	6	14	38	13%	£ 25,164
6 Little Hulton and Walkden	24	8	7	39	14%	£ 25,826
7 Ordsall and Langworthy	30	4	17.5	51.5	18%	£ 34,104
8 Swinton N&S, Pendlebury	18	8	3.5	29.5	10%	£ 19,535
9 Worsley and Boothstown	30	4	3.5	37.5	13%	£ 24,833
Total				286		£ 189,394

Stage 8: Deriving City-wide Allocations

The final stage of the budget matrix simply pulls together the information flowing out of the thematic allocation tables into a single city-wide table. This table then forms the basis upon which delivery agencies, community committees etc. can begin to develop their investment strategies.

Table 12 sets out the overall allocations across each area by each theme.

Table 12: City-wide allocations for Salford, showing expenditure by area across the seven themes

Area	Theme	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total per ward
		A Healthy City	A Safe City	A Learning and Creative City	Valuing Children and Young People	Inclusive city, with strong communities	Economic prosperity	Environment and housing	
1 Broughton and Blackfriars	£	12,175	£ 40,567	£ 9,470	£ 22,343	£ 25,790	£ 16,140	£ 14,238	£ 140,722
2 Claremont, Weaste and Seedley	£	5,756	£ 12,708	£ 5,892	£ 30,210	£ 20,508	£ 8,564	£ 16,555	£ 100,193
3 Eccles, Winton, Barton	£	9,076	£ 22,972	£ 7,786	£ 29,266	£ 21,440	£ 25,362	£ 24,171	£ 140,073
4 Irlam and Cadishead	£	5,977	£ 21,994	£ 3,577	£ 13,531	£ 9,632	£ 4,941	£ 4,967	£ 64,620
5 Kersal, Pendleton and Charlestown	£	10,626	£ 29,326	£ 8,838	£ 12,587	£ 12,429	£ 23,715	£ 25,164	£ 122,686
6 Little Hulton and Walkden	£	6,641	£ 14,663	£ 7,576	£ 31,469	£ 21,751	£ 9,881	£ 25,826	£ 117,807
7 Ordsall and Langworthy	£	9,519	£ 21,017	£ 9,470	£ 22,343	£ 18,333	£ 24,704	£ 34,104	£ 139,488
8 Swinton N&S, Pendlebury	£	5,091	£ 11,241	£ 4,840	£ 29,266	£ 19,576	£ 7,576	£ 19,535	£ 97,126
9 Worsley and Boothstown	£	3,321	£ 7,331	£ 3,157	£ 13,531	£ 9,632	£ 15,481	£ 24,833	£ 77,286
Total per theme	£	68,182	£ 181,818	£ 60,606	£ 204,545	£ 159,091	£ 136,364	£ 189,394	£ 1,000,000

Appendix 1: Population Statistics for Salford (1998)

SALFORD (1998 est)

	Total population	% Children under 16	% 16-59	% 60 or over
Total for the city	226,000	21	58	21
Total by ward				
BARTON	10,600	21	58	21
BLACKFRIARS	8,800	16	68	16
BROUGHTON	9,900	24	59	16
CADISHEAD	9,000	24	56	21
CLAREMONT	13,000	21	56	23
ECCLES	11,900	17	60	24
IRLAM	9,800	23	56	20
KERSAL	12,900	26	56	19
LANGWORTHY	9,800	22	62	14
LITTLE HULTON	11,100	26	52	22
ORDSALL	7,500	20	65	15
PENDLEBURY	14,000	22	56	23
PENDLETON	9,500	15	66	19
SWINTON NORTH	11,700	20	56	24
SWINTON SOUTH	12,700	20	56	25
WALKDEN NORTH	11,700	23	56	22
WALKDEN SOUTH	15,500	21	58	21
WEASTE AND SEEDLEY	10,000	18	55	27
WINTON	13,000	25	56	20
WORSLEY AND BOOTHSTOWN	13,600	17	61	21

Appendix 2: Index of Multiple Deprivation 2000 for Salford

Ward	Ward Name	Index of Multiple Deprivation Score	Rank of Index of Multiple Deprivation
BRFA	Barton	46.55	729
BRFB	Blackfriars	65.48	156
BRFC	Broughton	67.17	126
BRFD	Cadishead	33.27	1652
BRFE	Claremont	29.17	2099
BRFF	Eccles	34.37	1551
BRFG	Irlam	30.59	1914
BRFH	Kersal	34.45	1542
BRFJ	Langworthy	60.52	260
BRFK	Little Hulton	66.43	138
BRFL	Ordsall	64.86	166
BRFM	Pendlebury	41.34	1030
BRFN	Pendleton	63.30	201
BRFP	Swinton North	33.63	1608
BRFQ	Swinton South	23.01	3009
BRFR	Walkden North	43.98	880
BRFS	Walkden South	22.77	3043
BRFT	Weaste and Seedley	49.80	570
BRFU	Winton	52.86	471
BRFW	Worsley and Boothstown	10.70	6108