



---

**INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF  
PUBLIC SECTOR  
RELOCATION**

**COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT  
OF LOCATIONS**


Prepared for:

Sir Michael Lyons'  
Independent Review  
of  
Public Sector Relocation

**FINAL REPORT:  
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**18 DECEMBER 2003**

King Sturge  
7 Stratford Place, London W1C 1ST  
+44 (0)20 7493 4933  
E-mail: [angus.mcintosh@kingsturge.co.uk](mailto:angus.mcintosh@kingsturge.co.uk)



---

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

**CONTENTS**

	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 SCOPE</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2 METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1.3 FINDINGS AND COMMENTARY</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.4 CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>APPENDICES</b>	
<b>Appendix A</b> Information Support Contact Centre Scenario – base case	<b>23</b>
<b>Appendix B</b> Interactive Contact Centre Scenario – base case	<b>25</b>
<b>Appendix C</b> Back Office Scenario – base case	<b>27</b>
<b>Appendix D</b> Higher Value Back Office Scenario – base case	<b>29</b>
<b>Appendix E</b> Policy Scenario – base case	<b>31</b>
<b>Appendix F</b> Science Scenario – base case	<b>33</b>

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

**1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**1.1 SCOPE**

## This document is the Final Report submitted by King Sturge to Sir Michael Lyons' Independent Review of Public Sector Relocation.

## This report aims to provide an objective high-level assessment of the relative merits of alternative locations for public sector activity. This information is primarily for the use of the Independent Review Team and those bodies preparing for relocation.

## King Sturge has considered a wide range of locations against labour market, property market, quality of life and other factors to develop a clear understanding of areas across the United Kingdom.

## The analysed locations were then assessed in relation to six types of public sector activity in order to provide a hierarchy of areas best suited to each of the scenarios.

## It is important to note that this assessment is not designed to be an exhaustive list of locations. Areas other than those we have considered may also be suited to particular kinds of public sector activity and the factors we have included in developing our work-type scenarios may not be applicable to activities carried out in some Government departments or public sector bodies. Furthermore, with improved technological infrastructure across the UK, rural locations can now more easily accommodate business activity and this is an issue that should be considered within the wider Government strategy on relocation.

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

## King Sturge and the Independent Review of Public Sector Relocation expect that this analysis will be used as a reference tool by Departments developing detailed business cases required for successful relocations. We do not anticipate that the information contained in this report will, on its own, provide enough data for departments to select relocation destinations.

## **1.2 METHODOLOGY**

### **Selection of Locations**

## 102 areas within the United Kingdom were chosen for assessment. The selection was informed by discussion with the Independent Review of Public Sector Relocation and has focussed on the main towns and cities in the United Kingdom outside London and the South East with a population in excess of 100,000. The merits of broadening the scope of the study were considered, but felt to be outweighed by the loss of focus this would entail. Areas in the Eastern region considered to be relatively overheated were excluded from our analysis.

## Exceptions to this general approach were made to ensure the inclusion of Sustainable Communities within the South East region; the representation of all regions (some of which would have been under represented due to shortage of towns or cities with populations over 100,000) and the inclusion of a handful of areas within the Eastern region that are not subject to local overheating.

## The areas for selection are felt to be representative of the types of location likely to prove suitable for the relocation of public sector activity. However they are not intended to be a definitive list of locations.

## The list of areas considered by King Sturge can be found in the relocation tables in Appendices A-F of the full report.

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

**Location Data**

## King Sturge has collated a core set of comparative information consisting of 12 variables for each of the 102 locations. These factors are:

- ## District population
- ## Population growth projection from 2000 – 2010
- ## Working age population
- ## Unemployment rate
- ## Average weekly earnings
- ## Total employment
- ## Catchment population (within 30 minutes)
- ## Built office stock
- ## Prime office rents (in town)
- ## Prime office rents (out of town)
- ## Current surplus in the Government estate
- ## Future surplus in the Government estate

## Other factors largely relating to the skill base were included in each work-type scenario to ensure that the most appropriate labour market was captured.

## The full list of factors considered by King Sturge, the sources of that data and the approach taken to their inclusion in our analysis is examined in greater depth in Appendix K of the Full Report.

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

**Work Type Scenarios**

# King Sturge developed six scenarios to approximate different types of public sector activity. The scenarios were tested against locations by varying the emphasis or weighting of those variables considered to be of key importance to the delivery of each activity. The work types considered by King Sturge are as follows:

**Information Support Contact Centres:** this category of activity does not require personnel to have specialised knowledge. The typical functions carried out include handling telephone calls from members of the public, issuing forms, giving standard guidance and data processing. The variables were weighted to allow for the assumption that these activities could be consolidated in large centres due to the scope for staff to work across departments and that there would be little need for staff to travel to London.

**Interactive Contact Centres:** Staff engaged in these activities require a degree of specialised knowledge particular to the contact centre function being delivered (eg. NHS Direct, Inland Revenue tax queries) and the ability to interact with customers effectively over the telephone. For this scenario the variables were weighted to allow for the higher skills required, the limited scope for consolidation across departments and the low likelihood of staff needing to travel to London.

**Back Office processes:** includes clerical, routine processing and support functions that do not require higher level skills. This scenario is similar to Information Support Contact Centres. Variables were weighted to allow for the significant scope for consolidating these services across public sector organisations (for example with large sites servicing several organisations' back office needs). No need for staff to commute to London.

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

**Higher Value Back Office functions:** Requires higher level or job specific skills, likely to relate to IT, Human Resources and Finance functions.

**Policy functions:** Policy making, policy delivery, and regulatory activity were assessed under the policy scenario. These are areas of work in which a significant proportion of staff will have a first degree with some having further qualifications. Some staff will need access to London.

**Science functions:** This scenario attempts to model the needs of technical specialties within the public sector. A large proportion of staff will have a first degree and a significant proportion will have further qualifications. Access to an appropriate skills base is critical.

A detailed analysis of which factors were included for each scenario and the rationale for their selection can be found in Section 3 of the full report.

### **1.3 FINDINGS AND COMMENTARY**

## A scoring and ranking exercise has been carried out for the six relocation scenarios to determine which locations are best suited to accommodate the different work types. Each of the scenarios has generated a materially different hierarchy of locations.

## The tables below identify in alphabetical order the top quartile locations for each of the six scenarios. The full rankings by quartile for the base case of each scenario are listed in Appendices A-F.

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

- ## The tables include information on the property market capacity of each area based on King Sturge’s survey of each of the local office markets. This work was undertaken because locations that have the required skill base and available workforce but suffer from a poor stock of commercial property and a constrained pipeline of future development may present an obstacle to departments wishing to relocate in the short term. The symbol <sup>P</sup> in the tables denotes locations that fall within the top quartile of our assessment of property market capacity rankings and are therefore well placed to meet departments’ needs in the short-term (1-2 years). Over the longer-term, the majority of locations will be able to meet departments’ needs
- ## The relocation of central Government activities has the potential to contribute to the regional economic balance and improve national competitiveness. Bringing jobs and increased economic activity to those parts of the UK with both labour market flexibility and a skills base suitable for taking on the relocated activity may have a greater beneficial effect (both socially and economically) than if those jobs were transplanted to overheating areas. The tables below include each location’s position on the rankings of deprivation. Rankings exist for each constituent country rather than for the UK as a whole (England ranks 354 districts, Wales ranks 22 districts, Scotland 26 and Northern Ireland 26) therefore the deprivation scoring does not allow direct comparisons across country borders.
- ## These rankings assume that the activity being relocated is of moderate size (approximately 500 people). Significantly different outcomes are achieved if the analysis is flexed to reflect relocations that are substantially larger (say over 1,000) or smaller than this (say below 100). More detailed analysis of locations and the outcomes for a number of alternative scenarios can be found in the full version of this report.

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

**Information Support Contact Centre Scenario (top quartile locations)**

Location (district)	Deprivation index	Location (district)	Deprivation index
Blackburn with Darwen	26 / 354	Peterborough <sup>P</sup>	133 / 354
Bolton	78 / 354	Rhondda Cynon Taff	3 / 22
Bradford	64 / 354	Rochdale	42 / 354
Derry <sup>P</sup>	3 / 26	Rotherham	34 / 354
Dudley	142 / 354	Stockton-on-Tees	111 / 354
Fife	14 / 26	Stoke-on-Trent <sup>P</sup>	22 / 354
Kingston upon Hull	14 / 354	Sunderland	15 / 354
Kirklees	93 / 354	Swansea <sup>P</sup>	12 / 22
Leicester	35 / 354	Telford & Wrekin <sup>P</sup>	96 / 354
Liverpool <sup>P</sup>	5 / 354	Walsall	54 / 354
North Lanarkshire <sup>P</sup>	4 / 26	Wigan	57 / 354
North Tyneside	71 / 354	Wirral	70 / 354
Oldham	61 / 354		

Note: <sup>P</sup> denotes locations that fall within the top quartile under the property market capacity rankings

Deprivation Index: Lower numbers indicate more deprived areas.

The typical functions carried out include handling telephone calls from members of the public and issuing forms, giving standard guidance and carrying out data processing.

Key factors included aside from the core variables for this scenario were:

- €# Population with Level 2 skills (GCSE).
- €# Average travel to work time - contact centre workers are often on lower wages and rely on the place of work being within walking distance or accessible by public transport.

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

- €# Contact centres are often located in areas with high unemployment rates with a readily available workforce to tap into. Such locations are often areas of manufacturing decline and therefore the proportion of people employed within the manufacturing sector was included.
- €# The proportion of People Workers in each location has been included. People Workers include those involved in personal service occupations, sales and customer services.

Variables given particular weighting for this scenario were:

- €# Unemployment rate
- €# Average travel to work time
- €# Level 2 skills.

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

**Interactive Contact Centre Scenario (top quartile locations)**

Location (district)	Deprivation index	Location (district)	Deprivation index
Belfast <sup>P</sup>	2 / 26	Middlesbrough	44 / 354
Blackpool	32 / 354	Newcastle upon Tyne <sup>P</sup>	59 / 354
Bolton	78 / 354	North Lanarkshire <sup>P</sup>	4 / 26
Bradford	64 / 354	North Tyneside	71 / 354
Cardiff <sup>P</sup>	16 / 22	Nottingham <sup>P</sup>	12 / 354
Doncaster	38 / 354	Preston	95 / 354
Exeter	123 / 354	Sheffield	92 / 354
Fife	14 / 26	Stockton-on-Tees	111 / 354
Kingston upon Hull	14 / 354	Sunderland	15 / 354
Kirklees	93 / 354	Swansea <sup>P</sup>	12 / 22
Leicester	35 / 354	Wigan	57 / 354
Liverpool <sup>P</sup>	5 / 354	Wirral	70 / 354
Manchester <sup>P</sup>	7 / 354		

Note: <sup>P</sup> denotes locations that fall within the top quartile under the property market capacity rankings

Deprivation Index: Lower numbers indicate more deprived areas.

Staff engaged in these activities require a degree of specialised knowledge particular to the contact centre function being delivered (eg. NHS Direct, Inland Revenue tax queries) and the ability to interact with customers effectively over the telephone.

Key factors included asides from the core variables for this scenario were:

- ≠# Level 3 Skills (A-level) as the best match for the skills-level required for this scenario.
- ≠# Average travel to work time remains important for interactive contact centre operations so this variable is again included.

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

- €# The proportion of people currently employed within the public sector as skills may be transferable that are suitable for skilled public sector contact centre activity.
- €# As with the information support contact centre scenario, the People Workers occupation share has been included.

Variables given particular weight in this scenario were:

- €# Unemployment rate
- €# Average travel to work time
- €# Level 3 skills.

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

**Back Office Scenario (top quartile locations)**

Location (district)	Deprivation index	Location (district)	Deprivation index
Blackburn with Darwen	26 / 354	Rochdale	42 / 354
Bolton	78 / 354	Rotherham	34 / 354
Bradford	64 / 354	Stockton-on-Tees	111 / 354
Dudley	142 / 354	Stoke-on-Trent <sup>P</sup>	22 / 354
Fife	14 / 26	Sunderland	15 / 354
Kingston upon Hull	14 / 354	Telford & Wrekin <sup>P</sup>	96 / 354
Kirklees	93 / 354	Wakefield	62 / 354
Leicester	35 / 354	Walsall	54 / 354
North Lanarkshire <sup>P</sup>	4 / 26	Wigan	57 / 354
North Tyneside	71 / 354	Wirral	70 / 354
Oldham	61 / 354	Wolverhampton	33 / 354
Peterborough <sup>P</sup>	133 / 354	Wrexham	13 / 22
Rhondda Cynon Taff	3 / 22		

Note: <sup>P</sup> denotes locations that fall within the top quartile under the property market capacity rankings

Deprivation Index: Lower numbers indicate more deprived areas.

This scenario includes clerical, routine processing and support functions that do not require higher level skills. This scenario is similar to information support contact centres.

Key factors included asides from the core variables for this scenario were:

- €# Level 2 skills and the Other Workers occupation share are included as this work type is similar to back office processing and information support contact centres. Other Workers include administration and secretarial workers and therefore best represent the broadly clerical nature of back office processes.

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

- €# Average travel to work time.
- €# Manufacturing sector employment (as included for information support contact centres).

Variables given particular weight in this scenario were:

- €# Unemployment rate
- €# Average travel to work time
- €# Level 2 skills
- €# Other workers occupation share.

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

**Higher Value Back Office Scenario (top quartile locations)**

Location (district)	Deprivation index	Location (district)	Deprivation index
Birmingham <sup>P</sup>	43 / 354	Milton Keynes <sup>P</sup>	190 / 354
Bournemouth	118 / 354	Newcastle upon Tyne <sup>P</sup>	59 / 354
Bristol	116 / 354	Northampton	168 / 354
Cardiff <sup>P</sup>	16 / 22	Norwich	65 / 354
Derby <sup>P</sup>	104 / 354	Nottingham <sup>P</sup>	12 / 354
Edinburgh <sup>P</sup>	24 / 26	Peterborough <sup>P</sup>	133 / 354
Exeter	123 / 354	Plymouth	84 / 354
Fife	14 / 26	Preston	95 / 354
Glasgow <sup>P</sup>	1 / 26	Sheffield	92 / 354
Leeds <sup>P</sup>	146 / 354	Southend-on-Sea	134 / 354
Leicester	35 / 354	Stockport	204 / 354
Liverpool <sup>P</sup>	5 / 354	Swindon	228 / 354
Manchester <sup>P</sup>	7 / 354		

Note: <sup>P</sup> denotes locations that fall within the top quartile under the property market capacity rankings

Deprivation Index: Lower numbers indicate more deprived areas.

This scenario requires higher level or job specific skills, likely to relate to IT, Human Resources and Finance functions.

Key factors included asides from the core variables for this scenario were:

- €# Level 3 skills. Reflecting the higher skills levels required than the Back Office scenario.
- €# Banking, finance & insurance sector employment is the most relevant broad employment group.
- €# Knowledge workers occupation share has been included as this gives an indication to the proportion of people employed as professionals/managers.

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

Variables given particular weight in this scenario were:

- €# Level 3 skills
- €# Banking, finance & insurance sector employment
- €# Knowledge workers occupation share.

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

**Policy Scenario (top quartile locations)**

<b>Location (district)</b>	<b>Deprivation index</b>	<b>Location (district)</b>	<b>Deprivation index</b>
Bedford	188 / 354	Manchester <sup>P</sup>	7 / 354
Birmingham <sup>P</sup>	43 / 354	Medway	170 / 354
Bristol	116 / 354	Milton Keynes <sup>P</sup>	190 / 354
Cardiff <sup>P</sup>	16 / 22	Newcastle upon Tyne <sup>P</sup>	59 / 354
Colchester	218 / 354	Northampton	168 / 354
Coventry	75 / 354	Norwich	65 / 354
Derby <sup>P</sup>	104 / 354	Nottingham <sup>P</sup>	12 / 354
Glasgow <sup>P</sup>	1 / 26	Peterborough <sup>P</sup>	133 / 354
Ipswich	115 / 354	Sheffield	92 / 354
Leeds <sup>P</sup>	146 / 354	Southend-on-Sea	134 / 354
Leicester	35 / 354	Swindon	228 / 354
Liverpool <sup>P</sup>	5 / 354	Warrington <sup>P</sup>	181 / 354
Luton	91 / 354		

Note: <sup>P</sup> denotes locations that fall within the top quartile under the property market capacity rankings

Deprivation Index: Lower numbers indicate more deprived areas.

Policy making, policy delivery, and regulatory activity were assessed under the policy scenario.

For this scenario, smaller scale relocations may be more likely to occur. When the small-scale activities ranking was run the following locations fell into or out of the first quartile:

**Locations joining the first quartile**

- ∄# Ashford
- ∄# Bournemouth
- ∄# Cheltenham
- ∄# Exeter

**Locations falling out of the first quartile**

- ∄# Cardiff <sup>P</sup>
- ∄# Glasgow <sup>P</sup>
- ∄# Leeds <sup>P</sup>
- ∄# Liverpool <sup>P</sup>

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

€# Gloucester	€# Newcastle upon Tyne <sup>P</sup>
€# Preston	€# Sheffield
€# Telford & Wrekin <sup>P</sup>	€# Warrington <sup>P</sup>

Key factors included asides from the core variables for this scenario were:

- €# Level 4 (degree level) and above skills as these are areas of work in which a significant proportion of staff will have a first degree with some having further qualifications.
- €# Banking, finance & insurance sector employment and knowledge workers occupation share are the two work types most closely aligned with policy work and are prioritised for this scenario
- €# Travel time to central London by rail. The Policy scenario is the only one where King Sturge and the Public Sector Relocation Review team believe that travel time to London should come under consideration. Therefore, the travel time to central London by rail has been included within this ranking. However, with the improved technological infrastructure of the UK, travelling to London on a frequent basis may be less necessary for policy-makers and to represent this possibility a ranking excluding the travel to London variable is included within the additional rankings contained in the full version of our Final Report.

Variables given particular weight in this scenario were:

- €# Level 4 skills
- €# Banking, finance & insurance sector employment
- €# Knowledge workers occupation share
- €# Travel time to Central London by rail.

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

**Science Scenario (top quartile locations)**

Location (district)	Deprivation index	Location (district)	Deprivation index
Birmingham <sup>P</sup>	43 / 354	Milton Keynes	190 / 354
Bradford	64 / 354	Newcastle upon Tyne <sup>P S</sup>	59 / 354
Bristol <sup>S</sup>	116 / 354	Northampton	168 / 354
Coventry <sup>S</sup>	75 / 354	Norwich	65 / 354
Derby <sup>P</sup>	104 / 354	Nottingham <sup>P S</sup>	12 / 354
Edinburgh <sup>P</sup>	24 / 26	Peterborough <sup>P</sup>	133 / 354
Glasgow <sup>P</sup>	1 / 26	Plymouth	84 / 354
Ipswich	115 / 354	Preston	95 / 354
Leeds <sup>P S</sup>	146 / 354	Salford	28 / 354
Leicester <sup>S</sup>	35 / 354	Sheffield <sup>S</sup>	92 / 354
Liverpool <sup>P S</sup>	5 / 354	Swindon	228 / 354
Manchester <sup>P S</sup>	7 / 354	Warrington <sup>P</sup>	181 / 354
Medway	170 / 354		

Note: <sup>P</sup> denotes locations that fall within the top quartile under the property market capacity rankings. <sup>S</sup> indicates that the location has a university with significant research funding – this data is only available for England and it should be noted that Edinburgh and Glasgow universities both have extensive research capabilities.

Deprivation Index: Lower numbers indicate more deprived areas.

This scenario attempts to model the needs of technical specialties within the public sector. A large proportion of staff will have a first degree and a significant proportion will have further qualifications. Access to an appropriate skills base is critical.

The presence of a research intensive university is likely to be an important consideration for activities under this scenario. Following guidance from the Review team using data from the Higher Education Statistics Agency, universities with a significant level of research funding are marked with a <sup>S</sup> in the table above.

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

For this scenario, smaller scale relocations may be more likely to occur. When the small-scale activities ranking was run the following locations fell into or out of the first quartile:

**Locations joining the first quartile**

- €# Bedford
- €# Colchester
- €# Derry <sup>P</sup>
- €# Exeter
- €# Gloucester
- €# Luton
- €# Southend-on-Sea
- €# Telford & Wrekin

**Locations falling out of the first quartile**

- €# Birmingham <sup>P</sup>
- €# Bradford
- €# Coventry <sup>S</sup>
- €# Derby <sup>P</sup>
- €# Leeds <sup>PS</sup>
- €# Salford
- €# Sheffield <sup>S</sup>
- €# Warrington <sup>P</sup>

Key factors included asides from the core variables for this scenario were:

- €# Level 4 and above skills and the Knowledge Workers occupational share have been included as many staff are likely to have a first degree and a significant proportion will have further qualifications.
- €# The most relevant employment sector, albeit rather loosely, is banking, finance & insurance, and therefore this variable has been included, although it is not weighted as highly as the skills level and occupation share.

Variables given particular weight in this scenario were:

- €# Level 4 skills
- €# Knowledge workers occupational share
- €# Banking, finance & insurance sector employment.

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

King Sturge received various documents from interested parties including local authorities and land and property owners. Some documents were sent directly to King Sturge but the Review Team channelled relevant responses to the public consultation through to King Sturge.

The location information submitted to King Sturge that referred to areas that fell within the scope of our assessment has provided useful context for our analysis but has not impacted on our methodology for ranking locations. Submissions relating to areas that have not been included in our analysis have been retained and will be made available to OGC and departments considering relocation. Many of these additional areas may be suitable destinations for the relocation of public sector activities, however the timeframe of our work and the necessary constraints of our remit have not allowed us to carry out full analysis of these additional areas. It is important to note that King Sturge and the Independent Review team have not suggested that departments' relocation planning be limited to those areas assessed by King Sturge.

## **1.4 CONCLUSIONS**

The analysis of locations by King Sturge is intended to provide Sir Michael Lyons and public sector organisations considering relocation with an objective assessment of the relative merits of 102 areas across the United Kingdom. We are confident that areas that appear in the first quartile of our six work type scenarios will provide suitable settings for relocated activities. Many of the areas appearing in the second quartile also scored highly and will provide adequate support for relocated activity.

Successful relocation to areas in the third and fourth quartiles is significantly less likely. However, it is not for King Sturge to preclude the consideration of any of these locations by government departments.

The specifics of each business case will vary and may differ significantly from the six generic types of activity we have considered. Public sector bodies and government departments will have access to the full analysis underpinning King Sturge's findings and will be able to adjust our models to better reflect the specific types of activity they are looking to relocate.

King Sturge's baseline reveal that there is a significant degree of variation in the areas in the top quartile for each of the different scenarios. This reflects the effect of the weightings attached to different factors in each of the work types. Further discussion of how the weightings have been adjusted can be found in the full version of the Final Report.

A number of locations appear in the top quartile of several of the different work type scenarios. This recurrent high performance is unsurprising and reflects the fact that large urban centres are more likely to contain significant amounts of the resources needed for all the work types modelled by King Sturge.

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

King Sturge are aware that a number of issues that fall outside the scope of this report require further consideration. These are being addressed either by Sir Michael Lyons' Independent Review Team or by Experian Business Strategies who Sir Michael has retained to provide economic analysis for his review. These additional issues include:

- €# Analysis to determine the benefits of, and scope for, the clustering together of public sector activities in a handful of locations;
  
- €# Evaluating the impact that advances in Information and Communication Technologies have had on the debate about the geographical distribution of activity. This report has largely excluded rural areas because of the focus on placing the main towns/cities in the UK at the heart of the assessment. However, improved technology means rural areas can accommodate certain types of work (as demonstrated by policies employed in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland). By using technology and subject to management organisation it could be possible to locate very small clusters of employment (20 or less) in many settlements across the UK on a sustainable basis.
  
- €# Assessing the suitability of areas that are outside the scope of this analysis. King Sturge received various documents from interested parties including local authorities and land and property owners. Some documents were sent directly to King Sturge but the Review Team channelled relevant responses to the public consultation through to King Sturge. The documentation received has highlighted areas that are not included within the comparative assessment as they did not meet the criteria guiding our analysis. However, various areas not included in the analysis may be suitable for relocation activities. The Independent Review team has not limited departments' relocation planning to those areas assessed by King Sturge.

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

Finally, King Sturge believe that relocation offers a prime opportunity for public sector organisations to re-engineer business processes and management structures. This is not an issue that we have been able to analyse within this brief. The importance of operational reform being delivered alongside relocation is being given detailed consideration by Experian Business Strategies and the Independent Review Team.

**ANGUS McINTOSH**

**Partner**

**MIKE HENRY**

**Partner**

**VICKY HEATH**

**Senior Associate**

**For King Sturge**

**18 December 2003**

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

**APPENDIX A**

**INFORMATION SUPPORT CONTACT CENTRE SCENARIO**

**BASE CASE RANKINGS BY QUARTILE**

**(IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER)**

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

**Appendix A: Information Support Contact Centre Scenario: Base-Case, in Alphabetical Order**

<b>TOP QUARTILE</b>
Blackburn with Darwen
Bolton
Bradford
Derry
Dudley
Fife
Kingston upon Hull
Kirklees
Leicester
Liverpool
North Lanarkshire
North Tyneside
Oldham
Peterborough
Rhondda, Cynon, Taff
Rochdale
Rotherham
Stockton-on-Tees
Stoke-on-Trent
Sunderland
Swansea
Telford and Wrekin
Walsall
Wigan
Wirral

<b>SECOND QUARTILE</b>
Belfast
Blackpool
Bury
Carlisle
Coventry
Falkirk
Gateshead
Knowsley
Leeds
Middlesbrough
Milton Keynes
Newcastle upon Tyne
Newcastle-under-Lyme
Northampton
Norwich
Nottingham
Plymouth
Sheffield
South Lanarkshire
Stockport
Torbay
Wakefield
Waveney
Wolverhampton
Wrexham

<b>THIRD QUARTILE</b>
Barnsley
Birmingham
Bournemouth
Bridgend
Cardiff
Carrick
Colchester
Derby
Doncaster
Glasgow City
Gloucester
Harrogate
Ipswich
Lancaster
Manchester
Medway UA
Neath Port Talbot
Poole
Preston
Salford
Southend-on-Sea
Stafford
Warrington
West Lothian
Worcester

<b>FOURTH QUARTILE</b>
Aberdeen
Ashford
Bath and North East Somerset UA
Bedford
Bristol
Cheltenham
Chester
Crewe and Nantwich
Dundee
Edinburgh, City of
Exeter
Great Yarmouth
Luton
Macclesfield
Newport
Nuneaton and Bedworth
Salisbury
Scarborough
Shrewsbury & Atcham
Solihull
Stratford-on-Avon
Swindon
Taunton Deane
Tendring
Trafford
Warwick
York

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

**APPENDIX B**

**INTERACTIVE CONTACT CENTRE SCENARIO**

**BASE CASE RANKINGS BY QUARTILE**

**(IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER)**

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Appendix B: Interactive Contact Centre Scenario: Base-Case, in Alphabetical Order**

<b>TOP QUARTILE</b>
Belfast
Blackpool
Bolton
Bradford
Cardiff
Doncaster
Exeter
Fife
Kingston upon Hull
Kirklees
Leicester
Liverpool
Manchester
Middlesbrough
Newcastle upon Tyne
North Lanarkshire
North Tyneside
Nottingham
Preston
Sheffield
Stockton-on-Tees
Sunderland
Swansea
Wigan
Wirral

<b>SECOND QUARTILE</b>
Bath and North East Somerset UA
Blackburn with Darwen
Bury
Carrick
Derby
Derry
Dudley
Edinburgh, City of
Falkirk
Glasgow City
Lancaster
Leeds
Northampton
Norwich
Oldham
Peterborough
Plymouth
Rhondda, Cynon, Taff
Rochdale
Rotherham
Salford
Scarborough
Stoke-on-Trent
Torbay
West Lothian

<b>THIRD QUARTILE</b>
Barnsley
Bedford
Birmingham
Bournemouth
Bristol
Coventry
Dundee
Gloucester
Great Yarmouth
Ipswich
Knowsley
Medway UA
Milton Keynes
Newcastle-under-Lyme
South Lanarkshire
Southend-on-Sea
Stafford
Stockport
Swindon
Telford and Wrekin
Wakefield
Walsall
Warwick
Wolverhampton
York

<b>FOURTH QUARTILE</b>
Aberdeen
Ashford
Bridgend
Carlisle
Cheltenham
Chester
Colchester
Crewe and Nantwich
Gateshead
Harrogate
Luton
Macclesfield
Neath Port Talbot
Newport
Nuneaton and Bedworth
Poole
Salisbury
Shrewsbury & Atcham
Solihull
Stratford-on-Avon
Taunton Deane
Tendring
Trafford
Warrington
Waveney
Worcester
Wrexham

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

**APPENDIX C**

**BACK OFFICE SCENARIO**

**BASE CASE RANKINGS BY QUARTILE**

**(IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER)**

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

**Appendix C: Back Office Scenario: Base-Case, in Alphabetical Order**

<b>TOP QUARTILE</b>
Blackburn with Darwen
Bolton
Bradford
Dudley
Fife
Kingston upon Hull
Kirklees
Leicester
North Lanarkshire
North Tyneside
Oldham
Peterborough
Rhondda, Cynon, Taff
Rochdale
Rotherham
Stockton-on-Tees
Stoke-on-Trent
Sunderland
Telford and Wrekin
Wakefield
Walsall
Wigan
Wirral
Wolverhampton
Wrexham

<b>SECOND QUARTILE</b>
Barnsley
Belfast
Birmingham
Carlisle
Coventry
Derby
Derry
Doncaster
Falkirk
Gateshead
Knowsley
Leeds
Liverpool
Neath Port Talbot
Newcastle-under-Lyme
Northampton
Plymouth
Sheffield
South Lanarkshire
Stafford
Swansea
Torbay
Warrington
Waveney
West Lothian

<b>THIRD QUARTILE</b>
Blackpool
Bridgend
Bury
Colchester
Glasgow City
Gloucester
Harrogate
Luton
Manchester
Middlesbrough
Milton Keynes
Newcastle upon Tyne
Newport
Norwich
Nottingham
Nuneaton and Bedworth
Poole
Preston
Salford
Solihull
Southend-on-Sea
Stockport
Stratford-on-Avon
Swindon
Warwick

<b>FOURTH QUARTILE</b>
Aberdeen
Ashford
Bath and North East Somerset UA
Bedford
Bournemouth
Bristol
Cardiff
Carrick
Cheltenham
Chester
Crewe and Nantwich
Dundee
Edinburgh, City of
Exeter
Great Yarmouth
Ipswich
Lancaster
Macclesfield
Medway UA
Salisbury
Scarborough
Shrewsbury & Atcham
Taunton Deane
Tendring
Trafford
Worcester
York

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

**APPENDIX D**

**HIGHER VALUE BACK OFFICE SCENARIO**

**BASE CASE RANKINGS BY QUARTILE**

**(IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER)**

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Appendix D: Higher Value Back Office Scenario: Base-Case, in Alphabetical Order**

TOP QUARTILE	SECOND QUARTILE
Birmingham Bournemouth Bristol Cardiff Derby Edinburgh, City of Exeter Fife Glasgow City Leeds Leicester Liverpool Manchester Milton Keynes Newcastle upon Tyne Northampton Norwich Nottingham Peterborough Plymouth Preston Sheffield Southend-on-Sea Stockport Swindon	Aberdeen Bath and North East Somerset UA Bedford Bolton Bradford Cheltenham Colchester Coventry Dudley Ipswich Kingston upon Hull Kirklees Luton Medway UA North Lanarkshire Salford Sunderland Swansea Telford and Wrekin Trafford Warrington Warwick West Lothian Wirral York
THIRD QUARTILE	FOURTH QUARTILE
Ashford Belfast Blackpool Bury Chester Doncaster Falkirk Gloucester Macclesfield Middlesbrough North Tyneside Oldham Poole Rochdale Rotherham Salisbury Solihull South Lanarkshire Stafford Stockton-on-Tees Stoke-on-Trent Stratford-on-Avon Walsall Wigan Wolverhampton	Barnsley Blackburn with Darwen Bridgend Carlisle Carrick Crewe and Nantwich Derry Dundee Gateshead Great Yarmouth Harrogate Knowsley Lancaster Neath Port Talbot Newcastle-under-Lyme Newport Nuneaton and Bedworth Rhondda, Cynon, Taff Scarborough Shrewsbury & Atcham Taunton Deane Tendring Torbay Wakefield Waveney Worcester Wrexham

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

**APPENDIX E**

**POLICY SCENARIO**

**BASE CASE RANKINGS BY QUARTILE**

**(IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER)**

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

**Appendix E: Policy Scenario: Base-Case, in Alphabetical Order**

<b>TOP QUARTILE</b>
Bedford
Birmingham
Bristol
Cardiff
Colchester
Coventry
Derby
Glasgow City
Ipswich
Leeds
Leicester
Liverpool
Luton
Manchester
Medway UA
Milton Keynes
Newcastle upon Tyne
Northampton
Norwich
Nottingham
Peterborough
Sheffield
Southend-on-Sea
Swindon
Warrington

<b>SECOND QUARTILE</b>
Ashford
Bath and North East Somerset UA
Bolton
Bournemouth
Bradford
Cheltenham
Doncaster
Dudley
Edinburgh, City of
Exeter
Gloucester
Kingston upon Hull
Kirklees
Plymouth
Preston
Salford
Stockport
Swansea
Telford and Wrekin
Trafford
Wakefield
Walsall
Warwick
Wirral
Wolverhampton

<b>THIRD QUARTILE</b>
Aberdeen
Barnsley
Belfast
Chester
Fife
Great Yarmouth
Macclesfield
Middlesbrough
Newport
North Lanarkshire
Nuneaton and Bedworth
Poole
Rhondda, Cynon, Taff
Rotherham
Salisbury
Solihull
Stafford
Stoke-on-Trent
Sunderland
Taunton Deane
Tendring
Torbay
Waveney
Wigan
York

<b>FOURTH QUARTILE</b>
Blackburn with Darwen
Blackpool
Bridgend
Bury
Carlisle
Carrick
Crewe and Nantwich
Derry
Dundee
Falkirk
Gateshead
Harrogate
Knowsley
Lancaster
Neath Port Talbot
Newcastle-under-Lyme
North Tyneside
Oldham
Rochdale
Scarborough
Shrewsbury & Atcham
South Lanarkshire
Stockton-on-Tees
Stratford-on-Avon
West Lothian
Worcester
Wrexham

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

**APPENDIX F**

**SCIENCE SCENARIO**

**BASE CASE RANKINGS BY QUARTILE**

**(IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER)**

**PUBLIC SECTOR RELOCATION PROJECT:  
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF LOCATIONS  
FINAL REPORT – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Appendix F: Science Scenario: Base-Case, in Alphabetical Order**

<b>TOP QUARTILE</b>
Birmingham
Bradford
Bristol
Coventry
Derby
Edinburgh, City of
Glasgow City
Ipswich
Leeds
Leicester
Liverpool
Manchester
Medway UA
Milton Keynes
Newcastle upon Tyne
Northampton
Norwich
Nottingham
Peterborough
Plymouth
Preston
Salford
Sheffield
Swindon
Warrington

<b>SECOND QUARTILE</b>
Aberdeen
Bedford
Belfast
Bolton
Bournemouth
Cardiff
Colchester
Dudley
Exeter
Fife
Gloucester
Kingston upon Hull
Kirklees
Luton
North Lanarkshire
Southend-on-Sea
Stockport
Sunderland
Swansea
Telford and Wrekin
Trafford
Walsall
Wigan
Wirral
Wolverhampton

<b>THIRD QUARTILE</b>
Bath and North East Somerset UA
Blackpool
Cheltenham
Chester
Derry
Doncaster
Dundee
Falkirk
Great Yarmouth
Macclesfield
Middlesbrough
North Tyneside
Oldham
Poole
Rhondda, Cynon, Taff
Rochdale
Rotherham
Solihull
South Lanarkshire
Stockton-on-Tees
Stoke-on-Trent
Torbay
Wakefield
Warwick
West Lothian

<b>FOURTH QUARTILE</b>
Ashford
Barnsley
Blackburn with Darwen
Bridgend
Bury
Carlisle
Carrick
Crewe and Nantwich
Gateshead
Harrogate
Knowsley
Lancaster
Neath Port Talbot
Newcastle-under-Lyme
Newport
Nuneaton and Bedworth
Salisbury
Scarborough
Shrewsbury & Atcham
Stafford
Stratford-on-Avon
Taunton Deane
Tendring
Waveney
Worcester
Wrexham
York