First release findings

1. Population

**Birmingham**

Birmingham was the largest local authority by population in the whole of England and Wales. Birmingham has been estimated a population count of 1,073,000 as at Census date. ONS provided a breakdown of the components (counts and adjustments) used to estimate the population of Birmingham.

**Components of the Census estimate of usual residents for Birmingham:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Birmingham</th>
<th>West Midlands</th>
<th>England &amp; Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Census Estimate for</td>
<td>1,073,000</td>
<td>5,601,800</td>
<td>56,075,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count of usual residents</td>
<td>974,200</td>
<td>5,261,900</td>
<td>52,638,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change due to estimation and sample bias</td>
<td>73,600</td>
<td>271,000</td>
<td>2,804,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change due to over count adjustment</td>
<td>-6,900</td>
<td>-33,200</td>
<td>-352,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change due to bias adjustment</td>
<td>19,100</td>
<td>63,400</td>
<td>583,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change due to national adjustment</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>29,300</td>
<td>303,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change due to CE adjustment</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>97,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ONS, Crown Copyright 2012 - totals may not sum due to rounding

There is an estimated increase of 96,000 people compared to Census estimate of 2001, percentage increase of 9.8%. Birmingham is the only local authority in England and Wales with a population greater than a million. Birmingham was also the most densely populated local authority in the region with 4,000 people per square kilometre.

Birmingham is growing at a faster rate (9.8%) than England & Wales (7%), West Midlands Region (6.3%) and the West Midlands Metropolitan area (7.1%).

Out of the 8 Core Cities Birmingham has the fourth highest increase in population rate (9.8%) compared to 2001 Census.

1 The Census 2011 population estimate shows Birmingham’s population to be more than 40,000 higher than the Government’s latest Mid-Year Estimates of 2010 and 31,400 higher than the 2 rolled forward population estimate.

**1.1 Response Rate Percentages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>England</th>
<th>West Midlands</th>
<th>Birmingham Overall</th>
<th>Men Birmingham</th>
<th>Women Birmingham</th>
<th>Household Birmingham</th>
<th>Internet Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ONS, Crown Copyright 2012

The Birmingham response rate of 91% was lower than the response rate for England (94%), but the same as 2001 Census. The Census 2011 represents an increase in response in absolute terms against a significant growth in hard to count population groups.

---

1 The Census is based on the population as at Census date the 27th March 2011 and the 2010 Mid-Year estimate is based on the population as at the 30th June 2010.

2 Rolled forward population estimates are based on the 2010 indicative population estimates, plus the net effects of births, deaths and migration between id-2010 and Census day.
The percentage of Census forms returned by internet overall was 19%. A breakdown of internet response rate by ward can be found in appendix 1. Ladywood received the highest response rate by internet (29.3%), in comparison Shard End received the lowest 14.5%.

### 1.2 Total population percentages

The above chart illustrates the population percentage for each of the 5 year age bands in comparison to England and Wales.

#### 1.3 Census Birmingham Resident - 5 Year Age Bands Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% compared to 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,073,000</td>
<td>977,100</td>
<td>95,900</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 4</td>
<td>81,900</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>74,400</td>
<td>70,900</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>73,700</td>
<td>74,000</td>
<td>-300</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td>80,300</td>
<td>72,300</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24</td>
<td>93,900</td>
<td>74,200</td>
<td>19,700</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29</td>
<td>85,600</td>
<td>68,500</td>
<td>17,100</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34</td>
<td>79,200</td>
<td>74,700</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 39</td>
<td>71,400</td>
<td>71,200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 44</td>
<td>72,100</td>
<td>62,400</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 49</td>
<td>68,100</td>
<td>54,900</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 54</td>
<td>57,700</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 59</td>
<td>50,200</td>
<td>45,600</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 64</td>
<td>46,400</td>
<td>42,300</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 69</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>38,300</td>
<td>-800</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 74</td>
<td>32,600</td>
<td>35,600</td>
<td>-3,000</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 79</td>
<td>27,900</td>
<td>30,100</td>
<td>-2,200</td>
<td>-7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 to 84</td>
<td>21,100</td>
<td>20,900</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 to 89</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90+</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ONS, Crown Copyright 2012
Birmingham has a considerable variation in age groups, but has an increasingly young population. The Census recorded 404,200 young people under the age of 25 in Birmingham. This is 37.7% of Birmingham overall population. The most marked growth is seen amongst the number of young adults in their twenties (26%) and people in their late forties (24%). With an increase of 17.9% the number of preschool children is significantly higher than in 2001. The city has seen a 2.7% decrease from 142,000 in 2001 to 138,000 in 2011 in the number of people age 65 and over. However, the number of people aged 90 and over has increased by 18.5% (1,000), with very elderly men showing an increase of 54.5% (600).

1.4 2011 Census: Birmingham ³Usual Resident (Male & Female population) by five-year age group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Bands</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 4</td>
<td>42,300</td>
<td>39,600</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>38,200</td>
<td>36,200</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>37,900</td>
<td>35,800</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td>40,100</td>
<td>40,200</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24</td>
<td>45,500</td>
<td>48,400</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29</td>
<td>42,800</td>
<td>42,800</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34</td>
<td>39,200</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 39</td>
<td>35,800</td>
<td>35,600</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 44</td>
<td>35,600</td>
<td>36,500</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 49</td>
<td>33,500</td>
<td>34,600</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 54</td>
<td>28,400</td>
<td>29,300</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 59</td>
<td>25,300</td>
<td>24,900</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 64</td>
<td>22,700</td>
<td>23,700</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 69</td>
<td>18,100</td>
<td>19,400</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 74</td>
<td>15,100</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 79</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 to 84</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 to 89</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90+</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All people</td>
<td>527,800</td>
<td>545,200</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ONS, Crown Copyright 2012

³ A usual resident of the UK is anyone who, on Census day, was in the UK and had stayed or intended to stay in the UK for a period of 12 months or more, or had a permanent UK address and was outside the UK and intended to be outside the UK for less than 12 months. Students and school borders are counted at their term-time address.
The above table shows the percentage differences between sexes in Birmingham. In the majority of the age groups there are more females than male, except for the child age groups 0-14.

The pyramid above highlights the fact that Birmingham has a youthful population, with the highest increase since 2001 being between 20 – 29 age bands. The age bands make up 16.7% of Birmingham’s population. In comparison to England, Birmingham’s percentage is higher than the overall England percentage (13.7%) for the same age bands. This is most likely due to students coming into Birmingham to study at universities.

1.5 Birmingham’s Working Population (defined as those aged between 15 and 64)

Birmingham has a working age population of 704,900, (66%) of its population. This matches with the average working age percentage across England and Wales. Birmingham has seen an increase in the working age population compared with the 2010 Mid-Year Estimates of 19,400, a 2.8% difference.

The below table below refers to the difference in the 15 – 64 age population between the Mid-Year Estimates and Census 2011 for the Core Cities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>%Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>16,600</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>265,400</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>103,700</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>19,400</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>503,000</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>-2,300</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>-9,600</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>-6,800</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>-11,100</td>
<td>-5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>-19,100</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>-46,700</td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.5.1 Effect on Unemployment Rates

The above percentage differences have been applied to the denominators of the unemployment rate and proportion calculations as of July 2012. To make the calculations for the likely changes to the unemployment rates the assumption has been made that the percentage changes in the working age population are also the same for the economically active working age population - which are the denominators used for the unemployment rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Old Rate</th>
<th>New Rate (estimated)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle-upon-Tyne</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table suggest that there will be an improvement to the unemployment rates for Birmingham. However Birmingham still has the highest rate of unemployment compared to the Core Cities. (Information provided by BCC Development Directorate – July 2012)

2. Household

Birmingham has a Census household estimate of 410,700. The average household size for Birmingham is 2.56, this is slightly higher than the West Midlands Region and England and Wales average of 2.4.

1,051,400 (98%) of Birmingham’s population live in households and 21,700 (2%) live in communal establishments.

2.1. Comparison to 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Households</th>
<th>Household Population</th>
<th>Communal Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>410,700</td>
<td>1,051,400</td>
<td>21,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>390,792</td>
<td>960,609</td>
<td>16,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difference</td>
<td>19,908</td>
<td>90,791</td>
<td>5,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% difference</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ONS, Crown Copyright 2012

The table above demonstrates that in 2011 there were 1,051,400 residents living in households, this is a household increase of 90,791 (5.1%) since 2001. The number of residents in communal establishments has also increased to 21,700 an increase of 5,224 (31.7%) since 2001. The average household size has increased to 2.56 compared to 2.46 in 2001.
2.2. Household comparison to Census 2011 Core Cities, West Midlands Region and England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Cities</th>
<th>Household 2011</th>
<th>Households 2001</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>410,700</td>
<td>390,800</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>182,700</td>
<td>162,100</td>
<td>20,600</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>320,600</td>
<td>301,600</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>206,500</td>
<td>187,900</td>
<td>18,600</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>205,000</td>
<td>167,500</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>117,200</td>
<td>111,200</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>126,100</td>
<td>116,100</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>229,900</td>
<td>217,600</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>2,294,900</td>
<td>2,153,700</td>
<td>141,200</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>22,063,400</td>
<td>20,451,400</td>
<td>1,612,000</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England and Wales</td>
<td>23,366,000</td>
<td>21,660,500</td>
<td>1,705,500</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ONS, Crown Copyright 2012

Although Birmingham’s population increase has been above average, the increase in the number of households is the smallest of the core cities (up just 5.1% - compared to 22.4% increase in Manchester and 7.9% in England on average). However Manchester was one of the cities that resulted in a population and household undercount in 2001 Census.

2.3. Average Household Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Cities</th>
<th>Average household 2011</th>
<th>Average household 2001</th>
<th>Average household difference 2011 &amp; 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England and Wales</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ONS, Crown Copyright 2012

Birmingham has the biggest average household size compared to the Core Cities, West Midlands and England and Wales. This is 0.10 (4.1%) higher than 2001.

---

4 The 2001 Census resulted in an undercount for a number of cities including Manchester and Bristol. The figures used in table 2.2 for Households 2001 are based on the Census 2001 original household estimates produced by ONS.
3. Short Term Residents

The short-term UK residents - Birmingham:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Persons</td>
<td>5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The short-term UK residents - England:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Persons</td>
<td>187,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>92,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>95,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ONS, Crown Copyright 2012

Female short-term residents in Birmingham are slightly more (51%) than male (49%). England overall also have a very similar make up of short-term residents, female (50.7%) and Male (49.3%).

There was no short term resident data available in 2001 to compare against.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward Name</th>
<th>Percentage of internet returns (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birmingham</strong></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladywood</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bordesley Green</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparkbrook</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nechells</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washwood Heath</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgbaston</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selly Oak</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lozells and East Handsworth</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moseley and Kings Heath</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handsworth Wood</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soho</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Yardley</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborne</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockland Green</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall Green</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodge Hill</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acocks Green</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Barr</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stechford and Yardley North</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longbridge</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton New Hall</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton Trinity</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erdington</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bournville</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton Vesey</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton Four Oaks</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyburn</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandwood</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinton</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billesley</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Norton</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weoley</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northfield</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartley Green</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheldon</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscott</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingstanding</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shard End</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>