

1998 Index of

Local Deprivation

A Summary of Results

June 1998

Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions

CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Background	3
Consultation	3
Updating	4
Indicators in the Index of Local Deprivation (1998)	5
Methodology	6
Results	7
ANNEX A Differences between 1991 Index of Local Conditions and 1998 Index of Local Deprivation	11
ANNEX B Definitions of the indicators from the 1991 Census of Population	14
ANNEX C Index Methodology	15

Introduction

1. In 1997 the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions commissioned a team led by Professor Brian Robson from the Centre for Urban Policy Studies at the University of Manchester to update the 1991 Index of Local Conditions to a 1996 base and to realign it to the new local authority boundaries. This note summarises the procedures and sets out the results of the updated index at local authority level.
2. A longer report containing a fuller discussion of the updating procedure as well as an analysis of changes in patterns of deprivation between 1991 and 1996 will be published later in 1998.

Background

3. The 1991 Index of Local Conditions (ILC) was also developed by the Centre for Urban Policy Studies at the University of Manchester and was published by the Department of the Environment in 1994. Based mainly on data from 1991 it combined thirteen indicators from a range of domains of deprivation into a single deprivation score for each local authority district. The Index was produced at three spatial scales - local authority districts, wards and Census Enumeration Districts (EDs). The Index included 6 indicators at the ED scale, 7 at the ward scale and 13 at the local authority district scale. All the 6/7 indicators included at the ED/ward scales were from 1991 Census data, but the further 6 added at the LA district scale were from other data sources and were either not available or robust enough at the smaller scales. A full discussion of the development of the 1991 Index is contained in '1991 Deprivation Index: a review of approaches and a matrix of results' HMSO, London, (1995). ISBN 0-11-753049-2, price £ 21.

Consultation

4. A set of proposals for updating and revising the index was put forward by Professor Robson and a consultation paper seeking views on these was published by the DETR in December 1997. Over 200 responses to the consultation were received. These contained a wide range of proposals and comments, some of which have been taken on board in this update to the index. Others, however, require further consideration. In particular, the ward and ED level components of the index need to be updated with data on benefit receipt that will shortly be available from DSS. It is also likely that new sources of data will become available at the local authority district level over the next year. Therefore, it seems that in the longer term a more fundamental review of the index is necessary that will consider both the suitability of the existing and any new indicators, and also the methodology used. It is proposed to carry out such a review over the course of the next year with results expected in Spring 1999. Extensive discussions with index users and experts will form a key part of the review process.

Updating

CHANGES IN THE BOUNDARIES OF LOCAL AUTHORITY DISTRICTS

5. The 1993-1995 Review of Local Government resulted in a number of changes in the organisation of local authority areas in the period 1995-1998. Some local authorities changed their boundaries and/or their names, others just changed their names, whilst some merged with neighbouring districts to create new authorities. The 1998 Index of Deprivation has been calculated for all 354 local authority districts as they stood on April 1st 1998.

THE INDICATORS

6. In developing the original index, indicators were selected which: spanned the main aspects of deprivation; were derived from robust datasets; were easy to understand; and as far as possible did not duplicate each other. There were no indicators measuring population groups at risk of deprivation, (e.g. ethnic minorities, single parent families, elderly), whose members may or may not be deprived. Deprived members of these groups should be identified by the more direct measures of deprivation, such as unemployment or income support receipt. The same principles applied for updating the index.
7. Updating the 1991 indicators was inevitably complex. Although it was relatively straightforward to update the 6 non-census indicators there were still a number of issues that had to be addressed as a result of improved data becoming available since 1991. As a result, some of the non-census indicators have been refined. The unemployment indicator from the 1991 census was also substituted with claimant count unemployment from NOMIS.
8. The 1991 Census indicators proved much more difficult to update as the census is only carried out every ten years. Therefore, possible surrogate indicators were investigated to replace those district level indicators originally from the 1991 Census. Where it was proposed to use surrogate indicators to update the index these had to be relevant to the original domain in terms of their significance for deprivation. Surrogate indicators were found for two of the census indicators at district level, but not for the other four. Therefore, one of the 1991 indicators (children in unsuitable accommodation) has been dropped from the index altogether and 1991 census data retained for the other three.
9. All the ward and ED level indicators in the original index were from the 1991 census. As there is very little nationally robust data available at these levels from non-census sources it was not possible to update them. Therefore, 1991 data has been retained for the ward and ED level indexes for the present although there are plans to update these later in 1998. However, the 1991 indicator children in unsuitable accommodation has been dropped from the ward and ED level indexes to retain consistency with the district level index. This means that the set of indicators used in the ward and ED level indexes is different to that used at the district level.

10. This note is concerned with presenting the updated Index of Local Deprivation rather than a detailed discussion of how and why this differs from the 1991 Index. However, the changes from both the 1991 Index, and that set out in the December 1997 consultation paper, are briefly summarised at Annex A.

Indicators in the Index of Local Deprivation (1998)

11. As with the 1991 Index, the updated index has been produced at three spatial scales - local authority district, ward and enumeration district (ED). In April 1998 there were 354 local authority districts. The ward and ED level indexes are based on the 1991 census area definitions of which there were around 8,620 wards and approximately 101,000 EDs.

The District Level 'Degree' index

12. There are 12 indicators in the district level 1998 index of local deprivation. These are:

Indicator	Source/year	Denominator	Source
Economic			
Total unemployment	NOMIS, April 1997	Total Economically Active population	Estimate based on 1991 census and 1996 ONS population estimates
Male long-term unemployment	NOMIS, April 1997	Total male unemployment	NOMIS, April 1997
Low Income			
Income support recipients	DSS 1996	Total population 18+	ONS population estimates 1996
Non-income support recipients receiving council tax benefit	DSS 1996	Total population 18+	ONS population estimates 1996
Dependent children of income support recipients	DSS 1996	Total population 16 and under	ONS population estimates 1996
Health			
Standardised Mortality Rates (Under 75s)	ONS 1996		
Education			
Low educational attainment - % 15 year olds with no GCSE passes or gaining GCSEs passes at grades D-G only	DfEE 1996	Total number 15 year olds	ONS population estimates 1996
Low educational participation - % 17 year olds no longer in full time education	1991 Census	Total 17 year olds	1991 Census
Environment			
Derelict Land	DETR 1993	Total land area	DETR 1993
Crime			
Home Insurance weightings	Norwich Union, Royal and Sun Alliance, United Assurance 1997		
Housing			
Households lacking basic amenities plus all households in non-permanent accommodation	1991 Census	Total households	1991 Census
Overcrowded households (more than 1 person per room)	1991 Census	Total households	1991 Census

The Ward and ED Level Indexes

13. The indicators that make up the ward and ED level indexes are all from the 1991 Census. There are six indicators at the ward level and five at the ED level. These are:

At ward and ED levels:

- i. unemployment
- ii. children in low earning households
- iii. Households with no car
- iv. households lacking basic amenities*
- v. overcrowded households*

At the ward level only:

- vi. 17 year olds no longer in full time education*

14. The indicators marked with an * are also included district level index. Full technical definitions of the 1991 census indicators are given in Annex B.

Methodology

15. The statistical steps used to combine the individual indicators into an index are:

a. Standardisation

If indicators are to be combined, account has to be taken of the fact that, for example 15% is a high proportion on some of the indicators but is a low or medium proportion on others. Standardisation alters the values to make them statistically comparable. Signed Chi-square (χ^2) is the standardisation method used, principally because it takes account of the robustness of data where small numbers are involved and reflects absolute levels of deprivation.

b. Transformation

Indicators with a great range will tend to have a disproportionately high impact on the overall index. Therefore, the indicators must be transformed so that their distributions are as similar as possible. A logarithmic transformation was applied which has the effect of producing a distribution closer to the normal curve and dampening the impact of extreme values.

c. The standardised mortality ratio and insurance premium indicators

The SMR and insurance premium indicators are already expressed in an index form with respect to the England average. The procedures to get them in a suitable form to be combined with the other indicators are therefore different than for the other indicators. First, they have been converted to a scale where the national value is zero and the appropriate negative or plus sign added to indicate whether an area is above or below the national average on the indicator. However, as the chi-square methodology is not used this results in standardised values that are significantly smaller than for the other indicators, e.g. the highest value on the SMR indicator is 1.41, whereas on the other indicators it tends to

be in the range from 3.0 - 4.0. If, as in the 1991 Index the values for these two indicators were simply included in the index in this form then they would have considerably less influence on the overall index than the other indicators. Therefore, their values have been multiplied by two to give them a similar level of influence in the overall index.

d. Summing the indicators

The standardisation and transformation procedure produces a signed chi-square value for each of the indicators. A positive value shows that the area has a higher value than the norm (in this case England) on that particular indicator and a negative value, that it has lower value than the national average. The indicators then need to be combined to give the overall index score. In the 1991 Index, the values of each indicator were simply added together to produce either a positive or negative overall index score with zero interpretable as the average level of deprivation in England.

However, as the index is an index of deprivation rather than an index of affluence it is counterintuitive that positive values, i.e. deprived, on some indicators are cancelled out by good conditions, i.e. negative scores, on other indicators. This point was broadly supported by the majority of responses to the external consultation. Therefore, only the positive values, i.e. those greater than the England average, have been summed to give the overall index score for each area.

16. A technical explanation of the methodology is provided in Annex C.

Results

17. The geography of deprivation is dependent on the scale at which it is analysed. At different scales different patterns appear. Deprivation may be scattered across an area or concentrated in small pockets. For example, two local authorities may appear to have very similar overall levels of deprivation, but in practice deprived people or households in one may be spread evenly across its area, while in the other they are concentrated into a few neighbourhoods. Moreover, it is perfectly feasible for a district with a low overall index score to contain within it severe pockets of deprivation. In order to reflect such complex patterns the 1998 index (as with the 1991 index) is made up of four different measures based on three different spatial scales - local authority district, wards and enumeration districts (EDs). These are:

- The degree of deprivation - the overall district level score, based mainly on updated 1996 data

As well as the district level index score, there are three sub-district measures - intensity, ward level extent and ED level extent. Since the census data cannot be updated these are based on 1991 census data.

- the intensity of deprivation - the severity of deprivation in the LA taken as the average score of the worst three wards in the LA;
- the ward level extent - the proportion of the LA population living in wards that are within the 10% most deprived in England;

- the ED level extent - the proportion of the EDs in the LA that fall within the most deprived 7% of EDs in England.
18. Table 1 gives the overall index value and rank, and the value on each individual indicator at the district level. Ranks are out of all 354 English local authorities where 1 is the most deprived. Negative values are represented by negative signs with one negative sign indicating that the value is between 0 and -1, two negative signs between -1 and -2 and three negative signs, above -2. These are shown for information only as they do not contribute to the overall index score.
 19. Table 2 gives the values and ranks for each local authority district in England on the Intensity and Extent Measures. London boroughs are listed first followed by the metropolitan districts, the district councils and finally, the unitary authorities.

INTERPRETING THE RESULTS

20. The need to look at different spatial levels when examining patterns of multiple deprivation in an area has been noted above and to facilitate this, four different LA level index measures, based on district, ward and enumeration level data, have been produced. All four measures must be considered when determining the degree to which an area is deprived or not. However, there is no definitive way of deciding which areas are deprived and which are not. Different methods will produce different results. The following, therefore, gives broad guidelines on how to interpret the individual measures and factors to take into account when trying to ascertain whether there is significant deprivation within a local authority area and if so, how it is distributed.
21. A key consideration in using the index is how much emphasis is placed on the overall district level (degree) scores and rankings relative to the ED-extent, ward-extent and intensity measures (see paras 22 and 23 below). The key advantage of the district level scores, which measure deprivation across the whole local authority district, is that they are based on a large number of indicators (12) many of which have been updated to 1996 or 1997. On the other hand, the extent and intensity measures are important if one is interested in identifying authorities with pockets of deprivation within their boundaries. However, the disadvantages with these measures is that they are necessarily based on a smaller number of indicators and have not been updated since 1991.
22. The ward and ED extent measures of deprivation as set out in Table 2 enable patterns of deprivation to be examined at smaller spatial scales and are particularly useful for highlighting the existence of pockets of deprivation in generally less deprived areas. For example, authorities which only have a few, but nevertheless highly deprived small areas within them can be identified using these measures. For example, South Kesteven is ranked 310 = on the overall district level index but has over 5% of its population living in wards that are amongst the 10% most deprived in England giving it a rank of 137 on this measure.
23. The intensity of deprivation measure, also given in Table 2, is used to show the severity of deprivation in the worst three wards in the local authority. This is particularly useful in identifying the existence of severe areas of deprivation in local authorities that are made up of a mix of deprived and non-deprived areas and so do not score highly on the overall

district level index. Leeds for example, has a district level rank of 56, but deprivation in its worst areas is so severe that it is ranked 7th on the intensity measure.

24. One option for determining which areas are deprived is to organise the local authorities into groups according to how many of the indicators the authority scores above the national average on the district level index ie. number of positive scores. For example, one definition of authorities suffering from ‘multiple deprivation’ might be those authorities which have positive values on 4 or more of the 12 indicators; this would produce a list of 155 authorities. However, the key drawback is that there are authorities outside this group which contain small pockets of deprivation.
25. Another option, which takes account of the pockets of deprivation as well as the main index, would be to arbitrarily decide on break points in the ranks (eg. the top 50, 75 or 100 most deprived) and devise a list of deprived authorities by taking those with a ranking of 50 (or 75 or 100) or less on any of the 4 measures. A variant on this which would give the updated district level index more weight would be to take a higher threshold on this measure than on the other 3 measures, e.g. 75 on the district level index and 50 on one or more of the other measures.
26. A hybrid of both of these approaches would be to use the 4 or more positive values method as described in para 24 above, but add in those authorities not already on the list which have an index ranking of less than 100 (or whatever) on the ward-extent, ED-extent or intensity measures.

FURTHER INFORMATION

The index scores for individual wards and EDs can be obtained from The London Research Centre (Contact: Keith Folwell Tel. 0171 787 5658, e-mail keith.folwell@london-research.gov.uk).

Further copies of this summary are available from:

Dorrett Annon
Research, Analysis and Evaluation Division
Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions
Floor 1/H4
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London SW1E 5DU
Fax: 0171 890 3309 e-mail: d.annon@gtnet.gov.uk

or

Carole Dawson
Regeneration Directorate
Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions
4/G5
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London SW1E 5DU
Tel: 0171 890 3772

The summary is also available on the DETR Website at www.regeneration.detr.gov.uk.

The Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions publishes free information leaflets on a range of housing topics. For a copy of the Housing Publications Order Form please contact:

The Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions
Free Literature
PO Box 236
Wetherby
West Yorkshire LS23 7ND
Tel: 0870 1226236
Fax: 0870 1226237

ANNEX A

Differences between 1991 Index of Local Conditions and 1998 Index of Local Deprivation

TABLE A1: THE INDICATORS

1991 Index of Local Conditions	Proposals for updated Index of Deprivation set out in Consultation Paper - Nov 97	1998 Index of Local Deprivation
13 indicators across all LA districts	12 indicators across all LA districts	12 indicators across all LA districts
Unemployment (1991 census)*	Unemployment (ONS 1997)	<i>Unemployment (ONS 1997)</i>
Housing lacking amenities (1991 census)*	Housing lacking amenities (1991 census)	Housing lacking amenities (1991 census)
Overcrowded housing (1991 census)*	Overcrowded housing (1991 census)	Overcrowded housing (1991 census)
Children in unsuitable accommodation (1991 census)	Drop this indicator - no replacement	Indicator dropped - no replacement
Children in low earning households (1991 census)*	Children receiving free school meals (1996 DfEE data)	<i>Dependant children of income support recipients (1996 DSS data)</i>
Households lacking a car (income proxy) (1991 census)*	Households receiving housing assistance combined with households receiving council tax benefit (DSS 1996)	<i>Non income support recipients in receipt of council tax benefit (1996 DSS)</i>
Low educational participation aged 17 (1991 census)	Low educational participation aged 17 (1991 census)	Low educational participation aged 17 (1991 census)
Low educational attainment (% 15 yr olds gaining GCSE passes at grades D-G only as a proportion of all GCSE passes) (1991 DfEE)	Low educational attainment (% 15 yr olds gaining GCSE passes at grades D-G only plus those not gaining any GCSE passes) (1996 DfEE)	<i>Low educational attainment (% 15 yr olds gaining GCSE passes at grades D-G only plus those not gaining any GCSE passes) (1996 DfEE)</i>

1991 Index of Local Conditions	Proposals for updated Index of Deprivation set out in Consultation Paper - Nov 97	1998 Index of Local Deprivation
13 indicators across all LA districts	12 indicators across all LA districts	12 indicators across all LA districts
Standard Mortality ratios (1991)	Standard mortality ratios for under 75s (1995)(ONS)	<i>Standard mortality ratios for under 75 (1996) ONS - double weighted.</i>
Home Insurance weightings (crime proxy) (1991)	Home insurance weightings (1996) (Insurance companies) (crime proxy)	<i>Home insurance weightings (1996) (Insurance companies) (crime proxy) - double weighted.</i>
Derelict land (1988 DOE)	Derelict land (1993 DOE)	<i>Derelict land (1993 DOE)</i>
Male Long term unemployment/unemployment ratio (1991 DfEE)	Male Long term unemployment/ratio (1997 ONS)	<i>Male Long term unemployment/unemployment ratio (1997 ONS)</i>
Income support (DSS 1991)	Income support (DSS 1995)	<i>Income support (DSS 1996)</i>

Italic = straightforward updating from 1991 index

Bold Italic = changes more than straightforward updating

Plain text = no change from 1991 index

*Indicators also included in the 1998 ward and ED level indexes

TABLE A2: METHODOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES

1991 Index of Local Conditions	Proposals for updated Index of Deprivation set out in Consultation Paper - Nov 97	1998 Index of Local Deprivation
<p>Summing the individual indicators together to produce the overall index score.</p> <p>In 1991 all the chi-square values were simply added together, regardless of whether they were positive or negative to give the overall index score for an area. Thus, in 1991 a positive overall index score indicated that an area had above average levels of deprivation and a negative score that it had below average levels of deprivation.</p>	<p>It was proposed that only the positive scores were summed to give the overall index score to avoid positive values being cancelled out by negative values.</p>	<p>In the 1998 Index of Deprivation only the positive values have been added together to produce the overall index score. This method was applied to the district, ward and ED level indices.</p>
<p>Standardisation of the SMR and Insurance Premiums indicators</p> <p>These two indicators come in an index form. In the 1991 Index they were simply converted so that the England average was set to zero and the appropriate positive or negative sign added to indicate whether an area was above or below the England average.</p>	<p>The proposals set out in the consultation did not propose any changes in the way that these indicators were calculated.</p>	<p>A significant number of respondents to the consultation pointed out that these indicators had much less influence on the overall index than other indicators because of the way they had been calculated. In the 1998 Index the standardised values of these indicators have been multiplied by two so that they have a similar impact on the overall index.</p>

ANNEX B

Definitions of the indicators from the 1991

Census of Population

The 6 indicators from the 1991 Census of Population data are calculated from the following SAS cell numbers:

1991 Index of Local Conditions	Proposals for updated Index of Deprivation set out in Consultation Paper - Nov 97	1998 Index of Local Deprivation
<i>Unemployed</i>		S080078+S080232
Economically Active		S080012+S080166
<i>Children in low earning households</i> - with no earner or with only one parent in part-time employment		S360012+S360018+S360030+S360036+S360048+S400064+S400071
Dependent children		S360066
<i>Overcrowded Households</i> - with more than one person per room		S230003+S230004
(Total) Households		S230001
<i>Residents in Households lacking basic amenities</i> - lacking or sharing a bath/shower and/or WC, or in non-permanent accommodation		S200181+S200149
Residents in Households		S200141+S200149
<i>Households with no car</i>		S200131
Households		S200001
<i>17 year olds (no longer) in full time education</i>		S370041+S370042
17 year olds		S370029+S370030

ANNEX C

Index Methodology

Chi-square was chosen as the standardisation method primarily because it downweights values where the numbers counted are small and thus more likely to be unreliable, as is frequently the case at the ED scale. For example, 3 unemployed out of a workforce of 10, is less likely to be accurate than 30 out of 100. This is a weakness of standardisation methods based on percentages. The problem is compounded with census data because OPCS (as was) randomly add -1, 0 or +1 to all values to increase confidentiality of Census output. Hence, in the above example, 3 out of 10 could actually be 20% or 40%, whilst 30 out of 100 could only vary from 29% to 31%.

The following details the steps in the calculation of the signed chi-square values.

Chi-square (χ^2) is based on raw values, i.e. the actual numbers with and without a characteristic, rather than the proportion. It compares the observed value (O) in an area with the expected value (E), where E is the England rate for the characteristic applied to that area.

$$\chi^2 = \frac{(O1-E1)^2}{E1} + \frac{(O2-E2)^2}{E2}$$

where:

O1 is the observed value with a characteristic eg. unemployed;

E1 is the expected value with a characteristic;

O2 is the observed value without a characteristic eg. not unemployed; and

E2 is the expected value without a characteristic.

1 is then added to the chi-square values to avoid numbers smaller than 1 becoming negative when transformed.

A log transformation is applied.

Finally, a negative is assigned to all values where O1-E1 is a negative (the negative having been lost when squared).

Table 1 : 1998 Index of Local Deprivation - Local Authority District Scores and Values on 12 Indicators

LA DISTRICT	1998 Index (Degree) Score	Lacking Amenities	Over-crowded Households	17 year olds no longer in FT education	Derelict Land	Income Support	Children in IS households	Low/no GCSEs	Long term Unemployment	Unemployment	Insurance Premiums	SMR	Non IS CTB	No. positive scores	
Liverpool	40.07	1	2.38	1.96	1.81	3.80	4.82	4.49	2.57	3.04	4.31	3.25	3.36	4.29	12
Newham	38.55	2	3.86	4.08	0.95	3.89	4.62	4.53	1.82	2.23	3.96	3.30	2.91	3.83	12
Manchester	36.33	3	-	2.79	2.36	3.41	4.76	4.44	2.31	1.63	4.11	3.25	3.31	3.96	11
Hackney	35.21	4	3.52	4.02	-	1.85	4.73	4.47	0.75	2.98	4.86	3.13	2.57	3.02	11
Birmingham	34.67	5	-	3.83	1.58	2.60	4.61	4.47	2.41	2.91	4.06	2.48	2.43	3.29	11
Tower Hamlets	34.30	6	1.33	4.39	0.21	2.47	4.54	4.71	1.81	2.28	3.03	3.29	3.17	3.86	10
Sandwell	33.78	7	.87	2.82	2.51	3.74	3.84	3.86	2.54	2.38	3.29	1.56	2.89	3.69	12
Southwark	33.74	8	1.97	3.71	1.31	0.20	4.44	4.22	2.16	2.36	3.07	3.20	2.80	3.59	12
Knowsley	33.69	9	-	2.55	2.06	2.98	4.39	4.19	2.17	2.09	3.66	3.09	3.16	3.33	11
Islington	32.21	10	3.32	3.41	-	0.37	4.38	4.14	1.58	3.00	3.98	2.82	2.78	2.58	10
Greenwich	31.58	11	-	2.80	1.59	3.46	3.91	3.95	1.80	2.35	3.60	2.94	2.61	2.55	11
Lambeth	31.57	12	3.44	3.67	-	-	4.41	4.18	1.85	2.48	4.08	3.11	3.02	3.61	10
Haringey	31.53	13	3.76	3.56	-	0.55	4.47	4.28	1.32	2.73	3.98	3.02	2.26	1.61	11
Lewisham	29.44	14	2.45	3.27	0.38	-	4.22	4.08	1.08	2.87	3.85	2.98	2.78	1.90	11
Barking and Dagenham	28.89	15	-	3.00	2.24	3.63	3.63	3.70	1.92	1.43	2.51	1.54	2.97	2.14	11
Nottingham	28.44	16	-	1.71	2.41	1.78	4.08	4.06	2.66	2.36	3.60	2.74	2.88	3.02	10
Camden	28.23	17	3.63	3.44	-	0.27	4.02	3.82	-	2.31	3.49	2.97	1.99	2.19	10
Hammersmith and Fulham	28.19	18	3.60	3.43	-	-	3.72	3.74	0.39	2.57	3.36	2.63	2.80	1.88	10
Newcastle Upon Tyne	27.95	19	-	-	1.59	2.16	3.85	3.56	2.30	2.59	3.51	2.16	2.72	3.50	10
Brent	26.95	20	3.30	3.98	-	0.17	4.20	3.88	0.03	2.39	3.77	2.74	1.80	0.98	11
Sunderland	26.90	21	-	-	2.40	3.13	3.74	3.17	2.12	1.70	3.37	1.15	2.60	3.31	10
Waltham Forest	26.68	22	3.63	3.58	0.76	-	3.88	3.64	0.86	2.28	3.37	3.43	1.87	1.82	10
Salford	26.64	23	-	-	1.86	3.74	3.75	3.50	2.18	-	1.60	3.11	3.18	3.72	9
Middlesbrough	26.41	24	-	1.23	2.05	1.35	3.77	3.88	2.24	1.60	3.62	1.11	2.87	2.98	11
Sheffield	26.09	25	.88	-	2.26	3.41	3.60	2.88	2.34	2.11	3.48	-	1.68	3.43	10
Kingston Upon Hull	26.06	26	-	1.01	2.54	2.37	4.08	3.71	2.86	1.94	3.71	-	2.68	3.18	9
Wolverhampton	25.94	27	-	2.63	1.86	2.97	3.77	3.37	1.92	0.42	3.05	0.36	2.39	3.29	11
Bradford	25.84	28	-	3.43	1.81	2.17	3.66	3.61	2.78	1.75	2.83	1.80	2.16	1.82	10
Rochdale	25.13	29	-	2.57	1.64	2.49	3.33	3.17	1.23	-	2.03	2.41	2.97	3.30	10
Wandsworth	25.05	30	3.38	3.22	-	-	3.21	3.37	1.80	2.38	2.78	2.60	2.84	3.88	10
Walsall	25.02	31	-	2.61	1.98	3.46	3.28	3.02	2.19	1.79	2.77	-	1.77	2.14	10
Leicester	24.93	32	1.48	3.18	1.10	0.48	3.78	3.45	1.82	0.90	3.07	0.66	2.80	3.07	9
Oldham	24.82	33	-	2.72	1.87	3.51	2.99	2.99	1.99	-	-	2.56	2.92	3.26	9
Halton	24.69	34	-	1.28	1.29	3.18	3.37	3.22	1.80	1.73	2.87	2.14	3.05	3.77	10
Gateshead	24.58	35	-	-	1.98	3.36	3.42	2.66	1.85	1.26	2.71	1.03	2.70	3.62	10
Ealing	24.48	36	2.83	3.66	-	1.80	3.34	3.48	1.88	1.72	2.71	1.71	2.80	3.88	10
Hartlepool	23.72	37	-	-	1.84	2.83	3.27	2.97	2.27	1.21	3.22	-	2.96	3.35	9
South Tyneside	23.67	38	-	-	1.81	2.83	3.68	3.38	1.88	1.70	2.61	1.80	2.80	3.88	9
Doncaster	23.60	39	2.74	-	2.11	1.64	3.24	3.14	2.52	-	3.47	-	2.48	2.24	9

17/01/2000 10:00:00 AM

LA DISTRICT	1998 Index (Degree) Score	Lacking Amenities	Over- crowded Households	17 year olds no longer in FT education	Derelict Land	Income Support	Children in IS house- holds	Low/no GCSEs	Long term Unemploy- ment	Unemploy- ment	Insurance Premiums	SMR	Non IS CTB	No positive scores
Coventry	23.48	40	2.57	1.80	2.43	3.49	3.05	1.28	1.00	2.39	0.74	2.42	3.26	70
Blackburn with Darwen	23.04	41	2.97	1.67	3.33	3.30	3.30	1.78	—	—	0.74	3.00	2.94	6
Barnsley	22.30	42	—	2.30	3.89	2.75	2.87	2.50	—	2.70	—	2.97	3.32	6
Redcar and Cleveland	21.54	43	—	1.80	2.29	3.26	3.08	1.42	1.31	3.24	—	2.30	2.86	6
Wirral	21.25	44	—	—	1.76	3.78	3.47	0.93	—	3.50	2.62	2.47	2.73	6
St.Helens	20.98	45	—	1.46	2.71	3.10	2.86	0.92	0.00	2.48	1.91	2.56	2.96	10
Lincoln	20.70	46	1.40	1.43	3.80	3.02	2.80	1.17	0.78	3.01	—	0.87	2.14	17
Bolton	20.66	47	—	1.86	3.18	2.73	2.55	1.30	—	—	2.24	2.57	2.74	6
Stoke-on-Trent	20.61	48	—	1.40	3.72	2.58	2.71	2.10	—	—	—	2.79	2.65	6
Stockton-on-Tees	20.41	49	—	0.05	3.75	2.86	2.47	1.70	1.61	3.19	—	2.49	2.28	6
Rotherham	20.23	50	—	1.86	3.10	3.03	2.87	2.03	—	3.24	—	1.53	2.76	6
Blackpool	20.14	51	2.89	1.85	—	3.20	2.39	1.71	—	2.47	—	2.83	2.12	6
Easington	19.97	52	—	2.05	1.49	3.09	2.96	1.85	—	1.89	—	3.04	3.59	6
Tameside	19.78	53	—	1.63	2.88	2.84	1.44	1.58	—	—	2.60	2.71	3.21	6
Sefton	19.41	54	—	—	3.66	3.51	2.67	—	1.58	3.04	—	2.12	0.02	6
Barrow-in-Furness	19.38	55	2.01	—	2.14	3.07	2.16	0.88	—	2.37	—	2.27	1.91	6
Leeds	19.06	56	—	2.02	3.53	1.90	—	2.02	0.77	1.76	1.84	1.68	3.53	6
City of Westminster	19.05	57	3.65	3.71	—	3.07	3.24	—	—	1.55	2.83	0.99	—	7
Wansbeck	18.94	58	—	1.61	1.42	2.00	2.20	0.94	1.80	2.74	—	3.21	3.02	6
Hounslow	18.89	59	2.17	3.31	—	2.59	2.65	3.21	—	0.87	2.07	2.02	—	6
Brighton and Hove	18.75	60	2.74	1.97	—	3.49	2.71	—	2.80	3.55	—	1.49	—	7
Wear Valley	18.67	61	—	1.04	1.55	2.36	2.71	1.94	1.46	0.76	2.22	2.75	2.86	10
North Tyneside	18.67	62	—	—	3.00	2.94	1.64	1.02	—	2.93	1.12	2.63	3.49	6
Kensington and Chelsea	18.54	63	3.66	3.47	—	1.92	2.24	—	2.45	2.07	2.73	—	—	7
Thanet	18.06	64	1.35	—	0.75	3.28	2.89	1.29	0.99	3.21	—	1.77	2.56	19
Burnley	17.31	65	—	1.61	1.64	2.55	2.51	2.34	0.14	—	0.94	2.94	2.84	6
Norwich	17.31	66	1.27	—	1.79	1.41	3.03	2.82	1.16	—	—	2.22	2.86	6
Mansfield	17.30	67	—	1.88	3.15	1.61	1.99	2.22	—	2.32	—	1.19	2.03	6
Preston	17.13	68	—	1.85	0.73	2.74	2.52	1.14	—	1.61	—	2.82	2.05	6
Bristol	17.11	69	—	1.98	2.58	3.05	3.05	1.51	0.30	2.83	—	—	1.82	6
Enfield	16.85	70	—	2.61	—	3.07	3.34	—	2.41	2.76	2.48	—	1.22	6
Derby	16.37	71	—	—	2.16	3.12	2.77	1.42	1.29	2.71	—	0.06	0.02	6
Luton	16.34	72	—	3.03	1.23	2.91	3.32	—	1.37	3.43	—	1.43	7.75	18
North East Lincolnshire	16.20	73	—	1.52	—	3.06	2.48	2.17	—	3.25	—	1.32	2.38	7
Wakefield	16.00	74	—	2.12	3.67	1.60	0.15	1.81	—	1.61	—	2.58	2.57	18
Portsmouth	15.86	75	2.88	—	1.79	—	2.18	2.71	0.54	1.43	—	1.99	—	6
Hyndburn	15.84	76	—	1.48	1.82	2.94	1.78	0.95	1.34	—	0.16	2.77	2.68	17
Penwith	15.78	77	2.88	—	—	3.36	2.78	2.10	—	2.93	—	—	1.74	6
Southampton	15.70	78	1.93	2.53	1.84	—	2.73	3.05	—	2.24	—	1.34	—	17
Derwentside	15.26	79	—	1.54	—	2.68	1.28	1.29	—	2.30	—	2.98	3.18	7
Kirklees	15.23	80	—	2.77	1.41	2.70	0.98	—	—	—	—	—	—	7

LA DISTRICT	1998 Index (Degree) Score	Lacking Amenities	Over- crowded Households	17 year olds no longer in FT education	Derelict Land	Income Support	Children in IS house- holds	Low/no GCSEs	Long term Unemploy- ment	Unemploy- ment	Insurance Premiums	SMR	Non IS CTB	No positive scores	
Hastings	15.22	81	-.04	-	-	3.35	3.05	-	1.18	2.88	-	2.31	2.40	7	
Great Yarmouth	14.72	82	2.62	-	1.59	1.12	2.33	1.54	0.03	3.16	-	2.34	2.34	7	
Plymouth	13.86	83	1.59	-	1.25	1.66	2.75	1.94	-	3.09	-	1.60	-	7	
Harlow	13.50	84	-	2.54	1.58	-	0.15	2.23	1.62	0.70	-	1.94	2.78	8	
Wigan	13.47	85	-	-	1.90	3.72	1.23	-	-	-	1.96	2.40	2.26	8	
Bolsover	13.42	86	-	-	1.42	2.63	-	1.04	1.50	0.19	2.08	1.57	2.30	8	
Kerrier	13.32	87	3.68	-	-	3.96	2.12	1.05	-	-	2.51	-	-	5	
Croydon	13.12	88	-	2.57	-	-	1.32	3.00	-	2.36	1.71	2.12	-	8	
Ipswich	12.80	89	.04	-	2.03	1.76	2.49	2.31	-	-	2.01	-	2.15	7	
Redbridge	12.80	90	1.03	2.35	-	-	1.86	2.28	-	1.26	1.79	2.20	-	7	
Chesterfield	12.58	91	-	-	1.26	2.46	1.72	-	0.40	-	2.24	2.05	-	7	
The Wrekin	12.41	92	-	-	2.01	3.21	1.40	2.27	0.00	-	-	1.66	1.64	7	
Ashfield	12.25	93	-	-	2.27	2.60	-	0.10	2.02	0.78	1.66	0.13	2.49	8	
Blyth Valley	12.14	94	-	-	1.54	1.85	0.92	-	0.83	-	1.88	2.66	2.58	7	
Thurrock	12.11	95	-	.69	2.08	2.84	-	2.30	1.40	-	1.08	-	1.73	7	
Calderdale	12.04	96	-	1.49	1.16	1.89	-	1.43	1.19	-	0.03	-	2.49	7	
Torbay	11.86	97	1.79	-	-	1.62	3.09	2.56	-	-	2.80	-	-	5	
Isle of Wight	11.85	98	2.69	-	-	-	1.18	1.35	-	1.63	2.88	-	2.14	8	
Pendle	11.81	99	-	2.25	0.77	0.93	1.79	2.11	1.42	-	-	2.55	-	7	
Slough	11.75	100	.58	3.33	-	-	1.96	2.95	-	0.57	-	-	-	8	
Corby	11.61	101	-	-	1.57	2.92	1.34	1.76	0.30	-	-	2.64	0.89	7	
Alderdale	11.58	102	-	-	1.59	2.24	-	-	0.66	1.23	2.33	1.35	1.86	7	
Dover	11.13	103	2.34	-	1.07	1.96	-	-	-	-	2.20	1.74	1.83	8	
Southend-on-Sea	10.77	104	-	-	0.27	0.00	2.72	2.61	-	2.17	2.97	0.13	-	7	
Bournemouth	10.76	105	3.29	.04	-	-	2.76	1.66	-	0.74	2.26	-	-	8	
Copeland	10.68	106	.85	-	1.86	-	1.26	-	1.12	1.35	2.83	1.82	-	7	
Rossendale	10.56	107	-	.21	0.58	3.62	-	-	0.25	-	-	1.51	2.04	2.34	7
Sedgefield	10.24	108	-	-	1.96	-	1.44	-	0.75	-	-	2.60	3.26	7	
Swale	10.11	109	1.84	-	0.84	1.87	-	1.76	1.39	0.66	1.74	-	-	7	
Dudley	9.92	110	-	-	2.23	3.67	-	-	-	1.70	-	-	2.41	7	
North Lincolnshire	9.77	111	.72	-	0.56	1.76	-	-	1.73	-	0.89	1.81	2.30	7	
Reading	9.54	112	2.76	2.45	0.65	1.89	-	0.32	1.46	-	-	1.75	-	8	
Darlington	9.30	113	-	-	1.48	-	2.30	-	1.37	-	2.40	-	-	5	
North Warwickshire	9.18	114	-	-	0.93	3.21	-	-	1.01	-	-	1.97	2.46	7	
Restormel	9.06	115	3.71	-	-	2.19	-	-	-	-	2.34	-	0.84	4	
Bury	8.98	116	-	-	-	3.70	-	-	-	-	-	2.88	2.43	8	
Carrick	8.95	117	2.63	-	-	3.65	-	-	-	-	2.46	-	-	3	
Cannock Chase	8.88	118	-	-	1.93	3.33	-	-	1.16	-	-	0.77	1.99	7	
Nuneaton and Bedworth	8.84	119	-	-	1.73	2.70	-	-	0.99	-	-	1.15	2.27	5	
Hillingdon	8.75	120	-	2.71	-	2.62	-	-	-	0.49	-	1.67	1.26	8	
Waveney	8.44	121	1.61	-	1.58	-	-	0.04	-	-	2.95	-	2.26	5	

1998 Index Score in Waveney

LA DISTRICT	1998 Index (Degree) Score	Lacking Amenities	Over- crowded Households	17 year olds no longer in FT education	Derelict Land	Income Support	Children in IS house- holds	Low/no GCSEs	Long term Unemploy- ment	Unemploy- ment	Insurance Premiums	SMR	Non IS CTB	No positive scores
Merton	8.31	122	2.43	—	1.23	—	0.78	0.33	1.33	—	2.20	—	—	—
Bassetlaw	8.15	123	1.08	—	1.38	—	—	1.79	—	1.65	—	0.59	1.66	6
Medway Towns	8.04	124	2.64	0.26	1.78	—	0.92	—	—	—	—	1.35	—	—
Lancaster	7.75	125	2.55	—	1.92	—	—	—	—	1.62	—	1.66	—	4
Ellesmere Port and Neston	7.68	128	—	—	0.37	—	3.21	—	—	—	1.99	2.12	—	—
Shepway	7.48	127	1.12	—	—	1.79	1.74	0.02	0.26	2.55	—	—	—	6
Warrington	7.44	128	—	—	0.59	—	2.03	—	—	—	1.08	2.28	1.45	—
Trafford	7.42	129	—	—	—	—	3.21	—	—	—	2.78	1.42	—	3
Barnet	7.35	130	1.57	2.68	—	—	—	—	0.34	—	2.56	—	—	—
Basildon	7.20	131	—	—	1.95	1.58	2.60	0.80	—	0.01	—	—	0.28	6
Vale Royal	6.86	132	1.81	—	—	—	3.28	—	—	—	—	1.77	—	—
Fenland	6.80	133	2.80	—	1.06	—	—	2.02	—	—	—	1.11	—	4
Tendring	6.74	134	1.99	—	1.01	0.27	0.70	—	—	1.20	—	—	1.67	4
Peterborough	6.73	135	—	—	1.23	1.73	2.53	—	—	—	—	0.74	0.50	5
Gloucester	6.57	136	1.87	—	1.29	1.61	—	0.77	0.88	0.46	—	—	—	8
Erewash	6.39	137	—	—	1.66	2.61	—	0.73	—	—	—	—	1.20	4
Gravesham	6.21	138	—	—	1.12	2.67	—	0.90	—	1.62	—	—	—	—
Chester-le-Street	5.96	139	—	—	0.75	—	—	0.67	—	—	—	2.37	2.17	4
Carlisle	5.95	140	—	—	1.78	—	—	0.87	—	0.63	—	2.06	0.42	—
North East Derbyshire	5.89	141	—	—	0.08	2.30	—	0.69	—	—	—	0.32	2.30	5
Newcastle-under-Lyme	5.70	142	—	—	1.56	1.39	—	1.93	—	—	—	1.45	—	—
Havering	5.52	143	—	—	1.84	3.54	—	—	—	—	—	0.14	—	3
Chorley	5.48	144	—	—	0.70	2.43	—	—	—	—	—	1.96	—	—
Harrow	5.43	145	—	2.65	—	—	—	—	0.67	—	2.12	—	—	3
North Cornwall	5.43	146	2.71	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.96	—	—	1.58	—
Oxford	5.32	147	2.99	2.28	—	—	—	0.05	—	—	—	—	—	3
Bexley	5.27	148	—	—	0.68	1.78	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cambridge	5.26	149	2.61	—	—	2.30	—	0.04	—	—	—	—	—	4
Epping Forest	5.17	150	1.92	—	—	2.19	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Redditch	5.15	151	—	0.45	1.57	0.01	—	1.25	0.69	—	—	1.17	—	6
Berwick-Upon-Tweed	5.13	152	—	—	1.23	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Boston	5.10	153	2.18	—	1.07	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.86	3
Dartford	5.06	154	—	—	0.92	3.18	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Durham	5.00	155	—	—	—	1.92	—	0.07	—	—	—	1.65	1.36	4
Richmond Upon Thames	5.00	156	2.55	—	1.13	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Stevenage	4.94	157	—	—	0.71	—	—	0.01	1.49	0.59	—	—	1.85	5
Amber Valley	4.88	158	—	—	1.20	2.71	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Newark and Sherwood	4.83	159	2.04	—	0.00	0.54	—	0.45	—	—	—	—	1.60	5
West Lancashire	4.61	160	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
North West Leicestershire	4.55	161	—	—	0.91	2.49	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3
Caradon	4.45	162	2.23	—	—	2.21	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

LA DISTRICT	1998 Index (Degree) Score	Lacking Amenities	Over-crowded Households	17 year olds no longer in FT education	Derelict Land	Income Support	Children in IS households	Low/no GCSEs	Long term Unemployment	Unemployment	Insurance Premiums	SMR	Non IS CTS	No. positive scores
West Somerset	4.40	163	1.43	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.04	-	-	1.93	3
Tamworth	4.36	164	-	-	1.26	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Havant	4.34	165	-	.64	0.10	0.31	1.95	1.34	-	-	-	-	-	5
East Lindsey	4.33	166	3.27	-	0.04	-	-	0.36	-	-	-	-	0.66	3
Tomridge	4.30	167	2.37	-	-	-	-	-	0.68	-	-	-	-	3
Gosport	4.29	168	-	-	0.59	2.63	-	1.07	-	-	-	-	-	3
Northampton	4.24	169	-	-	1.14	1.22	-	0.40	-	-	-	1.48	-	4
Alnwick	4.22	170	-	-	0.59	-	-	0.97	0.47	0.99	-	-	1.20	3
Exeter	4.18	171	2.99	-	1.19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Scarborough	4.03	172	2.16	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.87	-	-	-	3
Castle Point	4.03	173	-	-	1.27	1.99	-	-	0.77	-	-	-	-	3
Weymouth and Portland	4.02	174	-	-	0.99	1.92	-	-	-	0.88	-	1.03	-	3
Gedling	3.85	175	-	-	-	2.80	-	1.06	-	-	-	-	-	2
Eastbourne	3.83	176	1.51	-	0.41	-	0.78	-	-	-	-	-	1.98	2
Stockport	3.81	177	-	-	-	1.84	-	-	-	-	1.97	-	-	2
Runnymede	3.75	178	3.75	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.12	-	-	-	1
Bromley	3.74	179	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.77	-	1.98	-	-	2
Sevenoaks	3.58	180	2.29	-	-	-	-	1.32	-	-	-	-	-	3
South Ribble	3.56	181	-	-	0.99	2.57	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
East Staffordshire	3.48	182	.25	-	0.52	1.13	-	-	-	-	-	1.59	-	4
City Of London	3.46	183	-	-	-	-	0.36	-	0.34	-	2.76	-	-	3
Wyre	3.38	184	2.94	-	0.44	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Melton	3.27	185	-	-	-	2.07	-	-	-	-	-	1.20	-	2
Ashford	3.27	186	2.24	-	0.76	-	-	0.27	-	-	-	-	-	3
Broxtowe	3.24	187	-	-	0.01	2.28	-	0.94	-	-	-	-	-	3
High Peak	3.23	188	-	-	-	0.99	-	0.11	-	-	-	2.13	-	3
South Bedfordshire	3.17	189	2.19	-	-	0.98	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Canterbury	3.11	190	2.52	-	-	-	-	-	0.69	-	-	-	-	2
South Oxfordshire	3.09	191	3.09	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Eden	3.04	192	2.29	-	0.76	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Teesdale	3.04	193	.68	-	0.00	-	-	0.00	-	-	-	2.36	-	4
Tewkesbury	3.03	194	3.03	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Teignbridge	2.98	195	2.98	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Herefordshire	2.91	196	2.91	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
East Dorset	2.91	197	2.91	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
New Forest	2.90	198	2.90	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Fylde	2.80	199	2.80	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Staffordshire Moorlands	2.80	200	2.45	-	0.29	-	-	0.05	-	-	-	-	-	3
Mole Valley	2.79	201	2.79	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Maldon	2.78	202	1.72	-	-	-	-	-	1.04	-	-	-	-	2
Watford	2.78	203	1.15	1.51	-	-	-	-	0.10	-	-	-	0.00	4

LA DISTRICT	1998 Index (Degree) Score	Lacking Amenities	Over- crowded Households	17 year olds no longer in FT education	Derelict Land	Income Support	Children in IS house- holds	Low/no GCSEs	Long term Unemploy- ment	Unemploy- ment	Insurance Premiums	SMR	Non IS CTB	No positive scores
Stratford-on-Avon	2.75	204	2.75	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
King's Lynn and West Norfolk	2.74	205	2.14	—	—	—	—	0.60	—	—	—	—	—	2
Purbeck	2.64	206	2.64	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
West Lindsey	2.63	207	2.63	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
South Bucks	2.62	208	2.62	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
Bracknell Forest	2.60	209	2.62	—	—	—	—	0.07	—	—	—	—	—	2
Stafford	2.59	210	2.94	—	1.05	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
South Shropshire	2.58	211	2.58	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Worcester	2.56	212	—	0.68	1.30	—	—	0.56	—	—	—	—	—	3
Wychavon	2.54	213	2.54	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
East Cambridgeshire	2.47	214	2.47	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
South Staffordshire	2.45	215	2.45	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Rother	2.43	216	2.07	—	—	—	—	—	0.35	—	—	—	—	2
Windsor and Maidenhead	2.42	217	2.41	—	—	—	—	—	0.01	—	—	—	—	2
Bedford	2.41	218	2.31	0.09	—	—	—	0.02	—	—	—	—	—	2
Milton Keynes	2.41	219	—	1.23	—	—	—	1.17	—	—	—	—	—	2
Kingston Upon Thames	2.40	220	2.20	—	0.20	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
South Cambridgeshire	2.38	221	2.38	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Salisbury	2.35	222	2.35	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Rochford	2.34	223	1.59	0.75	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
Cheltenham	2.28	224	1.41	—	—	—	—	—	0.87	—	—	—	—	2
Wexden	2.22	225	2.22	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
North Devon	2.22	226	2.22	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Newbury	2.15	227	2.15	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Winchester	2.15	228	2.15	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Tynedale	2.13	229	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2.13	—	1
Craven	2.13	230	2.13	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Swindon	2.12	231	—	1.98	0.14	—	—	0.00	—	—	—	—	—	3
Forest of Dean	2.11	232	2.11	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Vale of White Horse	2.08	233	2.08	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
West Devon	2.06	234	2.02	—	—	—	—	—	0.05	—	—	—	—	1
Oadby and Wigston	2.07	235	—	—	2.07	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Mid Suffolk	2.06	236	2.06	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Maidstone	2.06	237	2.06	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Tonbridge and Malling	2.05	238	—	—	2.05	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Guildford	2.04	239	2.04	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Macclesfield	2.02	240	—	—	2.02	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Suffolk Coastal	2.02	241	2.02	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Broxbourne	2.02	242	—	—	0.71	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Arun	1.97	243	1.97	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Malvern Hills(Post April 1998)	1.94	244	1.94	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1

LA DISTRICT	1998 Index (Degree) Score	Lacking Amenities	Over- crowded Households	17 year olds no longer in FT education	Derelict Land	Income Support	Children in IS house- holds	Low/no GCSEs	Long term Unemploy- ment	Unemploy- ment	Insurance Premiums	SMR	Non IS CTB	No positive scores
Crawley	1.93	245	—	.88	1.05	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
Sedgemoor	1.90	248	1.82	—	0.22	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
West Dorset	1.88	247	1.88	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
North Norfolk	1.86	248	1.86	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
South Somerset	1.85	249	.98	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.87	2
North Wiltshire	1.81	250	1.81	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
East Hampshire	1.78	251	1.78	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Mid Devon	1.77	252	1.77	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
South Holland	1.76	253	.70	—	0.37	—	—	—	—	—	0.70	—	—	3
North Kesteven	1.74	254	1.74	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Rushmoor	1.74	255	1.60	—	0.13	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
Taunton Deane	1.70	256	1.70	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.01	2
Forest Heath	1.70	257	1.58	—	0.06	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3
Wellingborough	1.68	258	.96	—	0.72	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
Derbyshire Dales	1.63	259	—	—	—	1.63	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Lewes	1.63	260	—	—	—	—	—	1.63	—	—	—	—	—	1
North Somerset	1.63	261	1.63	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Huntingdonshire	1.61	262	—	—	1.61	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
South Hull	1.59	263	—	—	—	—	—	0.67	—	—	0.93	—	—	2
South Derbyshire	1.56	264	—	—	1.56	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Horsham	1.56	265	1.56	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Tunbridge Wells	1.53	266	1.53	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Isles of Scilly	1.44	267	1.26	.18	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
Ryedale	1.44	268	1.30	—	0.12	—	—	—	0.01	—	—	—	—	3
Tandridge	1.44	269	1.44	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Harrogate	1.42	270	1.42	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Congleton	1.39	271	—	—	1.39	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Crewe and Nantwich	1.34	272	.00	—	1.34	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
Oswestry	1.30	273	.28	—	0.07	—	—	—	—	—	0.94	—	—	3
Rushcliffe	1.22	274	1.12	—	—	0.10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
East Riding of Yorkshire	1.08	275	—	—	—	—	—	1.08	—	—	—	—	—	1
Breckland	1.07	276	—	—	1.04	—	—	0.03	—	—	—	—	—	1
Cotswold	1.07	277	1.07	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Bath and North East Somerset	1.06	278	—	—	1.06	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Worthing	1.03	279	1.03	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
East Devon	1.02	280	1.02	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Poole	.90	281	—	—	0.90	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
West Oxfordshire	.88	282	.88	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Lichfield	.86	283	—	—	0.86	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Sutton	.84	284	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.84	—	—	1
North Dorset	.84	285	.84	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1

1998 Index of Local Deprivation

LA DISTRICT	1998 Index (Degree) Score	Lacking Amenities	Over- crowded Households	17 year olds no longer in FT education	Derelict Land	Income Support	Children in IS house- holds	Low/no GCSEs	Long term Unemploy- ment	Unemploy- ment	Insurance Premiums	SMR	Non IS CTB	No positive scores
North Shropshire	.77	286	.77	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
South Gloucestershire	.76	287	-	0.76	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Broadland	.70	288	-	0.70	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Reigate and Banstead	.67	289	.67	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Wycombe	.65	290	.65	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Wyre Forest	.64	291	-	0.54	-	-	-	0.10	-	-	-	-	-	2
Hinckley and Bosworth	.60	292	-	0.60	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Chester	.52	293	.18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.35	-	2
Braintree	.49	294	-	0.49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Bridgnorth	.47	295	.47	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Chichester	.42	296	.42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Three Rivers	.29	297	-	-	0.29	-	-	-	0.01	-	-	-	-	2
Kettering	.28	298	-	0.28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Castle Morpeth	.19	299	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.19	-	-	-	-	1
East Northampton	.14	300	.14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Colchester	.13	301	-	0.13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
St Albans	.12	302	-	-	0.12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Hertsmere	.06	303	-	-	-	-	-	0.06	-	-	-	-	-	1
Shrewsbury and Atcham	.05	304	-	0.05	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Mid Bedfordshire	.05	305	.05	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Adur	.00	306	-	-	-	-	-	0.00	-	-	-	-	-	1
Spellthorne	.00	307	-	0.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Blaby	.00	308	-	-	-	-	-	0.00	-	-	-	-	-	1
St. Edmundsbury	.00	309	.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Aylesbury Vale	.00	310	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Babergh	.00	310	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Basingstoke and Deane	.00	310	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Brentwood	.00	310	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Bromsgrove	.00	310	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Charnwood	.00	310	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Chelmsford	.00	310	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Cherwell	.00	310	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Chiltern	.00	310	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Christchurch	.00	310	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Dacorum	.00	310	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Daventry	.00	310	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
East Hertfordshire	.00	310	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Eastleigh	.00	310	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Elmbridge	.00	310	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Epsom and Ewell	.00	310	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Fareham	.00	310	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0

LA DISTRICT	1998 Index (Degree) Score	Lacking Amenities	Over-crowded Households	17 year olds no longer in FT education	Derelict Land	Income Support	Children in IS households	Low/no GCSEs	Long term Unemployment	Unemployment	Insurance Premiums	SMR	Non IS CTB	No positive scores
Hambleton	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Harborough	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Hart	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Kennet	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Mendip	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Mid Sussex	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
North Hertfordshire	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Ribble Valley	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Richmondshire	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Rugby	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Rutland	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Selby	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
South Hams	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
South Kesteven	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
South Lakeland	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
South Norfolk	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
South Northamptonshire	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Stroud	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Surrey Heath	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Test Valley	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Utterford	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Warwick	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Waverley	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Welwyn Hatfield	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
West Wiltshire	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Woking	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Wokingham	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
York	.00	310=	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0

NOTES:

1. Negative (i.e. non-deprived) values are shown symbolically as follows:

- values between -0.00 and -0.99
- values between -1.00 and -1.99
- values of -2.00 and over

2. The total Index values show '0' for those authorities in which all values are negative.

Table 2. Local Authority District Values and Rank Positions on Degree, Intensity, Ward and ED level Extent Measures								
DISTRICT NAME	Degree score	Degree Rank	Average worst 3 wards	Ward Intensity (Rank)	% LA population in worst 10% wards	Ward Extent (Rank)	% EDs in Worst 7%	ED Extent (Rank)
City Of London	3.48	183	3.0	287	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Hackney	35.21	4	14.7	8	100.01	1	60.79	1
Hammersmith and Fulham	25.75	10	14.3	17	88.53	3	30.85	9
Haringey	31.53	13	14.2	12	79.26	7	30.85	9
Islington	32.31	10	13.8	22	100.00	3	30.85	9
Kensington and Chelsea	16.54	63	13.4	28	41.82	28	16.54	24
Lambeth	21.27	27	14.7	9	89.42	4	30.85	9
Lewisham	29.44	14	13.9	19	53.58	17	16.86	20
Newham	24.75	20	14.5	10	100.00	3	30.85	9
Southwark	33.74	8	14.2	14	88.98	6	39.11	4
Lower Harleia	24.30	22	15.1	5	99.99	2	30.85	9
Wandsworth	25.06	30	11.9	48	36.45	35	8.23	57
City of Westminster	19.05	37	13.5	20	88.29	19	30.85	9
Barking and Dagenham	28.69	15	11.0	65	46.40	22	4.51	89
Barnet	7.36	130	9.8	108	9.74	105	1.01	190
Bexley	5.27	148	7.8	147	6.48	127	1.14	181
Brent	28.95	20	14.1	18	48.88	21	30.85	9
Bromley	3.74	179	9.7	97	12.51	88	2.00	148
Croydon	13.12	68	11.1	83	11.14	91	2.72	125
Ealing	24.48	36	11.8	52	29.58	48	7.14	66
Enfield	16.88	70	10.2	79	14.93	77	3.38	119
Greenwich	31.58	11	12.2	45	58.27	16	15.24	28
Harrow	5.43	145	3.9	237	0.00	188	0.00	277
Havering	5.52	143	10.2	81	8.13	117	1.15	179
Hillingdon	8.78	120	4.4	222	0.00	158=	0.46	228
Hounslow	18.89	59	8.2	132	5.07	136	3.49	112
Kingston Upon Thames	2.40	220	5.4	198	0.00	158=	0.87	244
Merton	8.31	122	9.0	110	9.33	107	3.89	106
Redbridge	12.80	90	10.5	78	14.78	78	2.35	141
Richmond Upon Thames	5.00	158	3.1	287	0.00	158=	0.28	250
Sutton	8.4	124	8.0	142	5.01	139	1.15	178
Waltham Forest	26.68	22	14.2	13	66.77	12	16.34	25
Bolton	20.88	47	13.6	24	29.73	47	11.73	37
Bury	8.98	116	7.9	143	6.28	130	2.62	131
Manchester	36.33	3	15.2	4	77.98	8	31.10	3
Oldham	24.82	33	13.5	25	34.88	37	14.09	31
Rochdale	25.13	29	12.3	43	38.63	33	14.29	30
Salford	26.84	23	13.3	30	31.43	44	10.72	43
Stockport	3.81	177	9.5	100	3.78	149	3.11	120
Tameside	19.78	53	9.8	90	10.11	100	4.08	97
Trafford	7.42	129	10.6	72	9.34	108	3.95	102
Wigan	13.47	85	10.3	78	10.58	96	5.28	82
Knowsley	33.89	9	14.1	15	72.50	10	38.18	5
Liverpool	40.07	1	15.9	2	71.22	11	34.22	6
St.Helena	20.96	45	10.8	88	20.81	62	8.70	54
Sefton	19.41	54	11.0	84	32.52	42	9.90	47
Wirral	21.25	44	12.8	38	21.40	60	10.81	42
Barnsley	22.30	42	10.5	73	23.07	56	6.62	70
Doncaster	23.80	39	12.5	40	41.15	30	10.85	41
Rotherham	20.23	50	11.3	58	16.71	71	7.05	67
Sheffield	26.09	25	14.8	6	36.33	38	13.38	32
Gateshead	24.58	35	11.7	54	30.30	48	9.47	51
Newcastle Upon Tyne	27.95	19	12.9	34	39.08	32	19.01	18
North Tyneside	18.67	62	10.1	83	17.60	70	4.59	86
South Tyneside	23.87	38	10.4	76	28.94	50	9.69	50
Sunderland	26.90	21	12.2	44	36.65	34	13.08	34
Birmingham	34.67	5	16.8	1	64.61	15	24.88	11
Coventry	23.48	40	13.4	27	34.77	38	15.00	27
Dudley	9.92	110	10.7	70	22.57	58	3.83	108
Sandwell	33.78	7	13.3	29	50.02	19	10.95	40
Solihull	1.59	263	11.5	57	21.34	61	2.63	128
Walsall	25.02	31	12.7	39	45.82	23	8.49	55
Wolverhampton	25.94	27	13.5	28	40.87	31	14.66	28
Bradford	25.94	28	15.6	3	42.15	27	21.47	13

1995 Index of Local Deprivation

DISTRICT NAME	Degree score	Degree Rank	Average worst 3 wards	Ward Intensity (Rank)	% LA population in worst 10% wards	Ward Extent (Rank)	% EDs in Worst 7%	ED Extent (Rank)
Calderdale	12.04	90	11.0	55	22.68	57	7.21	82
Kirklees	15.23	80	11.2	59	29.16	49	7.61	82
Leeds	19.06	56	14.3	7	33.30	30	8.16	75
Wakefield	16.00	74	9.9	85	9.23	108	3.88	107
Mid Bedfordshire	.05	305	2.5	313	0.00	158	0.00	253
Bedford	2.41	218	9.9	87	18.12	68	3.75	109
South Bedfordshire	3.17	189	4.2	227	0.00	158	0.00	253
Aylesbury Vale	.00	310	4.8	213	0.00	158	0.87	194
Chiltern	.00	310	2.8	301	0.00	158	0.00	253
South Bucks	2.62	206	3.6	246	0.00	158	0.00	253
Wycombe	.65	290	5.1	207	0.00	158	0.95	176
Cambridge	5.26	149	5.7	190	0.00	158	0.94	190
East Cambridgeshire	2.47	214	3.0	278	0.00	158	0.00	253
Fenland	6.80	133	6.2	179	0.00	158	1.63	159
Huntingdonshire	1.61	262	2.0	336	0.00	158	0.64	206
South Cambridgeshire	2.36	221	3.2	285	0.00	158	0.72	203
Chester	.52	293	9.2	108	6.57	138	3.00	146
Congleton	1.39	271	2.4	322	0.00	158	0.00	253
Crewe and Nantwich	1.34	272	8.0	139	0.00	158	3.16	118
Eilesmere Port and Neston	7.66	126	8.9	112	4.60	142	2.56	133
Macclesfield	2.02	240	3.0	279	0.00	158	0.57	215
Vale Royal	6.66	132	7.5	152	4.78	141	3.14	119
Caradon	4.45	162	3.0	286	0.00	158	0.00	253
Carrick	8.95	117	5.5	194	0.00	158	2.27	144
Kerrier	13.32	67	6.2	131	7.43	120	4.10	106
North Cornwall	5.43	146	2.8	300	0.00	158	0.00	253
Penwith	15.78	77	7.8	146	6.50	117	1.97	170
Restormel	9.08	115	5.3	200	0.00	158	0.50	225
Isles of Scilly	1.44	267	2.7	307	0.00	158	0.00	253
Allerdale	11.56	102	8.5	123	3.34	153	0.45	229
Barrow-in-Furness	19.36	55	6.6	117	7.30	122	5.44	80
Carlisle	5.95	140	7.2	159	0.00	158	3.42	114
Copeland	10.66	106	8.4	126	6.05	118	3.70	110
Eden	3.04	192	2.5	314	0.00	158	0.00	253
South Lakeland	.00	310	2.6	309	0.00	158	0.00	253
Amber Valley	4.68	158	3.9	236	0.00	158	0.00	253
Bolsover	13.42	86	7.2	156	0.00	158	1.45	162
Chesterfield	12.58	91	8.5	122	3.76	150	1.57	160
Derbyshire Dales	1.63	259	1.9	341	0.00	158	0.00	253
Erewash	6.39	137	7.1	160	3.37	152	2.28	143
High Peak	3.23	186	5.9	186	4.04	147	1.08	184
North East Derbyshire	5.89	141	6.9	165	0.00	158	0.50	223
South Derbyshire	1.56	264	2.3	324	0.00	158	0.63	212
East Devon	1.02	280	3.3	261	0.00	158	0.00	253
Exeter	4.16	171	6.1	136	5.65	132	3.90	108
Mid Devon	1.77	252	2.7	303	0.00	158	0.00	253
North Devon	2.22	226	6.7	170	0.00	158	0.92	161
South Hams	.00	310	2.4	321	0.00	158	0.00	253
Teignbridge	2.66	195	4.8	214	0.00	158	0.36	239
Torridge	4.30	167	3.5	255	0.00	158	0.65	207
West Devon	2.06	234	2.1	332	0.00	158	0.00	253
Christchurch	.00	310	1.6	349	0.00	158	0.00	253
East Dorset	2.91	197	3.9	235	0.00	158	0.56	216
North Dorset	.84	285	2.3	327	0.00	158	0.00	253
Purbeck	2.84	206	2.7	304	0.00	158	0.00	253
West Dorset	1.88	247	2.7	302	0.00	158	0.38	242
Weymouth and Portland	4.02	174	6.3	177	0.00	158	0.66	196
Chester-le-Street	5.96	139	6.7	171	0.00	158	4.50	90
Derwentside	15.26	79	6.3	129	0.00	158	2.37	136
Durham	5.00	155	7.1	161	3.18	154	2.38	136
Easington	19.97	52	10.1	82	15.91	75	4.02	99
Sedgefield	10.24	108	8.4	128	5.52	136	3.93	103
Teesdale	3.04	193	3.4	258	0.00	158	0.00	253
Wear Valley	18.67	61	9.9	86	16.30	73	7.53	83
Eastbourne	3.83	176	6.5	173	8.50	113	2.69	127
Hastings	15.22	81	9.8	91	9.89	102	5.00	83

DISTRICT NAME	Degree score	Degree Rank	Average worst 3 wards	Ward Intensity (Rank)	% LA population in worst 10% wards	Ward Extent (Rank)	% EDs in Worst 7%	ED Extent (Rank)
Lewes	1.83	280	3.4	259	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Rother	2.43	216	6.0	181	0.00	158=	0.51	221
Wealden	2.22	225	5.2	203	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Basildon	7.20	131	7.9	144	0.00	158=	0.64	211
Braintree	7.46	124	2.5	311	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Brentwood	.00	310=	1.7	346	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Castle Point	3.03	173	3.3	283	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Chelmsford	.00	310=	4.3	226	0.00	158=	0.32	248
Colchester	.13	301	6.8	166	3.77	131	0.00	253=
Epping Forest	5.17	150	3.9	234	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Harlow	13.50	84	6.0	183	0.00	158=	0.68	204
Maldon	2.78	202	3.5	252	0.00	158=	0.83	197
Rochford	2.34	223	3.5	249	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Tendring	6.74	134	8.4	127	0.00	158=	2.05	146
Uttlesford	.00	310=	1.7	347	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Cheltenham	2.28	224	7.4	153	0.00	158=	1.38	168
Cotswold	1.07	277	3.1	298	0.00	158=	0.50	208
Forest of Dean	2.11	232	3.0	284	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Gloucester	6.57	139	9.7	96	14.32	79	6.37	172
Stroud	.00	310=	2.1	333	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Tewkesbury	3.03	194	4.9	211	0.00	158=	2.83	129
Basingstoke and Deane	.00	310=	4.5	220	0.00	158=	0.33	247
East Hampshire	1.78	261	2.7	305	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Eastleigh	.00	310=	2.8	297	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Fareham	.00	310=	1.7	345	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Gosport	4.29	168	3.5	251	0.00	158=	3.97	101
Hart	.00	310=	1.5	351	0.00	158=	1.28	175
Havant	4.34	165	9.8	88	12.67	86	4.55	87
New Forest	2.90	196	3.0	282	0.00	158=	0.25	252
Rushmoor	1.74	255	4.3	224	0.00	158=	1.34	172
Test Valley	.00	310=	3.1	298	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Winchester	2.15	228	3.0	281	0.00	158=	0.97	187
Bromsgrove	.00	310=	5.0	210	11.05	93	1.81	156
Malvern Hills	1.94	244	3.4	257	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Redditch	5.15	151	5.4	195	7.44	119	1.42	165
Worcester	2.58	212	6.8	172	0.00	158=	1.75	157
Wychevton	2.84	213	3.0	275	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Wyre Forest	.84	291	5.8	189	0.00	158=	2.62	130
Broxbourne	2.02	242	3.7	244	0.00	158=	1.33	173
Dacorum	.00	310=	2.4	317	0.00	158=	0.40	237
East Hertfordshire	.00	310=	1.5	352	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Hertsmere	.08	303	3.9	236	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
North Hertfordshire	.00	310=	3.4	258	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
SLAlbans	.12	302	3.0	276	0.00	158=	0.44	233
Stevenage	4.94	157	4.8	217	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Three Rivers	.29	297	4.6	216	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Watford	2.78	203	6.3	176	8.30	118	1.35	171
Welwyn Hatfield	.00	310=	3.8	248	0.00	158=	0.52	219
Ashford	3.27	186	7.0	183	4.35	145	0.48	228
Canterbury	3.11	190	8.5	119	8.34	129	2.81	132
Dartford	5.06	154	5.7	191	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Dover	11.13	103	7.8	145	0.00	158=	0.88	193
Gravesham	6.21	138	8.0	140	0.00	158=	5.52	78
Maidstone	2.06	237	6.8	168	0.00	158=	1.82	154
Sevenoaks	3.58	180	4.1	230	0.00	158=	0.48	227
Shepway	7.48	127	9.8	89	9.83	104	4.04	98
Swale	10.11	109	8.3	130	5.84	133	2.85	121
Thanet	18.08	64	10.0	84	17.82	69	6.54	71
Tonbridge and Malling	2.05	238	2.8	296	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Tunbridge Wells	1.53	286	3.1	270	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Burley	17.31	85	11.2	61	18.18	74	14.43	29
Chorley	5.48	144	4.4	221	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Fylde	2.80	199	3.8	245	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Hyndburn	15.84	76	9.7	93	13.00	85	5.52	79
Lancaster	7.75	125	9.7	92	4.24	148	6.94	68
Pendle	11.81	99	9.7	95	12.00	90	6.74	69

1998 Index of Local Deprivation

DISTRICT NAME	Degree score	Degree Rank	Average worst 3 wards	Ward Intensity (Rank)	% LA population in worst 10% wards	Ward Extent (Rank)	% EDs in Worst 7%	ED Extent (Rank)
Preston	17.13	66	13.0	33	42.97	28	13.18	53
Ribble Valley	.00	310	1.8	343	0.00	158	0.00	253
Rossendale	10.56	107	5.1	209	0.00	158	0.73	212
South Ribble	3.58	181	4.1	231	0.00	158	0.50	222
West Lancashire	4.81	160	9.0	111	4.99	140	3.92	104
Wyre	3.38	184	7.7	148	3.43	151	2.33	142
Blaby	.00	306	1.0	354	0.00	158	0.00	253
Charnwood	.00	310	6.7	169	0.00	158	1.03	185
Harborough	.00	310	2.5	312	0.00	158	0.00	253
Hinckley and Bosworth	.60	292	2.4	320	0.00	158	0.54	218
Melton	3.27	185	1.9	340	0.00	158	0.00	253
North West Leicestershire	4.55	161	3.5	250	0.00	158	0.00	253
Leicestershire and Wigtson	2.07	235	2.0	337	0.00	158	0.00	253
Boston	5.10	153	5.9	185	0.00	158	2.44	135
East Lindsey	4.33	166	9.4	102	8.49	114	2.70	126
Lincoln	20.70	46	9.3	105	15.57	76	9.88	48
North Kesteven	1.74	254	3.5	254	0.00	158	0.00	253
South Holland	1.78	253	1.9	339	0.00	158	0.00	253
South Kesteven	.00	310	5.6	163	5.39	137	1.53	163
West Lindsey	2.63	207	7.3	158	9.00	110	2.36	139
Breckland	1.07	276	5.6	162	0.00	158	0.00	253
Broadland	.70	288	3.1	273	0.00	158	0.00	253
Great Yarmouth	14.72	82	11.1	62	10.76	95	7.73	61
King's Lynn and West Norfolk	2.74	205	9.2	108	8.89	111	1.45	183
North Norfolk	1.86	246	2.1	334	0.00	158	0.00	253
Norwich	17.31	66	9.7	98	6.45	128	3.20	117
South Norfolk	.00	310	2.6	310	0.00	158	0.39	243
Corby	11.61	101	8.1	138	13.52	80	1.89	150
Daventry	.00	310	1.8	344	0.00	158	0.00	253
East Northampton	.14	300	2.0	338	0.00	158	0.00	253
Kettering	.28	296	5.9	167	0.00	158	0.61	213
Northampton	4.24	169	10.5	74	13.34	82	2.03	147
South Northamptonshire	.00	310	1.1	353	0.00	158	0.00	253
Wellingborough	1.68	258	5.4	188	0.00	158	1.33	174
Ainwick	4.22	170	5.1	208	0.00	158	0.00	253
Berwick-Upon-Tweed	5.13	152	4.5	219	0.00	158	0.00	253
Blyth Valley	12.14	94	8.6	118	9.87	103	1.84	152
Castle Morpeth	.19	299	4.6	215	0.00	158	1.82	155
Tynedale	2.13	229	3.2	284	0.00	158	0.00	253
Wansbeck	18.94	58	8.5	125	6.77	125	6.30	73
Craven	2.19	230	3.0	280	0.00	158	0.00	253
Hambleton	.00	310	1.6	348	0.00	158	0.00	253
Harrogate	1.42	270	5.1	204	0.00	158	0.26	251
Richmondshire	.00	310	3.0	274	0.00	158	0.00	253
Ryedale	1.44	268	1.8	342	0.00	158	0.00	253
Scarborough	4.03	172	8.7	115	5.80	134	4.20	94
Selby	.00	310	5.1	206	0.00	158	0.00	253
Ashfield	12.25	93	7.3	154	0.00	158	1.95	149
Bassetlaw	8.15	123	9.2	107	10.89	94	4.16	95
Broxtowe	3.24	187	4.0	233	0.00	158	0.50	224
Gedling	3.85	175	4.6	218	0.00	158	0.97	166
Mansfield	17.30	67	8.7	114	3.87	148	4.67	85
Newark and Sherwood	4.63	159	6.2	178	0.00	158	2.35	140
Rushcliffe	1.22	274	3.7	242	0.00	158	0.96	168
Cherwell	.00	310	6.0	184	0.00	158	1.15	177
Oxford	5.32	147	10.6	71	20.68	63	5.53	77
South Oxfordshire	3.09	191	4.3	225	0.00	158	0.39	240
Vale of White Horse	2.08	233	2.9	293	0.00	158	0.00	253
West Oxfordshire	.88	282	3.0	286	0.00	158	0.43	236
Bridgnorth	.47	295	2.2	331	0.00	158	0.00	253
North Shropshire	.77	286	2.4	323	0.00	158	0.00	253
Oswestry	1.30	273	2.9	290	0.00	158	0.00	253
Shrewsbury and Atcham	.05	304	5.2	201	0.00	158	1.42	166
South Shropshire	2.58	211	3.3	262	0.00	158	0.00	253
Mendip	.00	310	2.5	316	0.00	158	0.43	234
Sedgemoor	1.90	246	5.2	202	0.00	158	0.85	195

DISTRICT NAME	Degree score	Degree Rank	Average worst 3 wards	Ward Intensity (Rank)	% LA population in worst 10% wards	Ward Extent (Rank)	% EDs in Worst 7%	ED Extent (Rank)
South Somerset	1.85	249	3.4	260	0.00	158=	0.30	246
Taunton Deane	1.70	258	5.1	205	0.00	158=	1.44	184
West Somerset	4.40	163	2.2	330	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Cannock Chase	8.88	118	7.3	157	6.91	123	1.89	151
East Staffordshire	3.48	182	6.1	137	4.56	143	1.38	160
Lichfield	.86	283	4.1	232	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Newcastle-under-Lyme	5.70	142	7.3	155	0.00	158=	1.67	150
South Staffordshire	2.45	215	5.8	188	2.74	155	0.90	192
Stafford	2.58	210	6.0	182	0.00	158=	0.39	238
Staffordshire Moorlands	2.80	200	5.4	197	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Tamworth	4.36	164	6.3	175	0.00	158=	2.54	134
Babergh	.00	310=	3.0	277	0.00	158=	0.52	220
Forest Heath	1.70	257	3.8	247	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Ipswich	12.80	89	8.8	113	13.25	83	3.46	113
Mid Suffolk	2.08	238	2.4	316	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
St. Edmundsbury	.00	309	4.2	228	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Suffolk Coastal	2.02	241	3.1	271	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Waveney	8.44	121	9.4	104	10.35	99	2.81	123
Elmbridge	.00	310=	2.3	328	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Epsom and Ewell	.00	310=	2.6	308	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Guildford	2.04	239	3.0	283	0.00	158=	0.80	198
Mole Valley	2.79	201	3.1	272	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Reigate and Banstead	.87	289	2.8	295	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Runnymede	3.75	178	4.2	229	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Spelthorne	.00	307	2.4	319	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Surrey Heath	.00	310=	2.9	289	0.00	158=	0.85	208
Tandridge	1.44	289	2.8	299	0.00	158=	0.67	205
Waverley	.00	310=	2.3	325	0.00	158=	0.45	230
Woking	.00	310=	5.3	199	0.00	158=	0.64	210
North Warwickshire	9.18	114	2.2	328	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Nuneaton and Bedworth	8.84	119	9.4	101	12.63	87	4.55	88
Rugby	.00	310=	3.7	243	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Stratford-on-Avon	2.75	204	3.5	253	0.00	158=	0.35	248
Warwick	.00	310=	6.1	180	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Adur	.00	308	2.9	292	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Arun	1.97	243	6.9	167	0.00	158=	0.66	206
Chichester	.42	298	3.0	288	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Crawley	1.93	245	4.9	212	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Horsham	1.58	265	2.2	329	0.00	158=	0.44	232
Mid Sussex	.00	310=	2.1	335	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Worthing	1.03	279	7.0	162	7.33	121	2.27	145
Kennet	.00	310=	2.5	315	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
North Wiltshire	1.81	250	2.8	294	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Salisbury	2.35	222	4.4	223	0.00	158=	0.77	199
West Wiltshire	.00	310=	2.9	291	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Bath and North East Somer	1.08	278	6.9	164	0.00	158=	1.13	182
Blackburn with Darwen	23.04	41	12.9	36	32.20	43	18.18	17
Blackpool	20.14	51	13.7	23	21.99	59	11.99	38
Bournemouth	10.76	105	11.7	53	19.98	65	7.73	80
Bracknell Forest	2.60	209	3.7	241	0.00	158=	0.00	253=
Brighton and Hove	18.75	60	12.3	41	34.42	39	8.04	59
Bristol	17.11	69	12.3	42	24.82	53	6.14	75
Darlington	9.30	113	9.8	99	12.40	89	7.44	64
Derby	16.37	71	12.9	35	28.30	51	11.39	39
East Riding of Yorkshire	1.08	275	8.5	121	1.87	157	1.53	161
Halton	24.69	34	9.7	94	16.52	72	10.26	46
Hartlepool	23.72	37	12.0	47	44.85	25	20.57	15
Herefordshire	2.91	196	6.4	174	0.00	158=	0.43	235
Isle of Wight	11.85	98	7.5	151	0.00	158=	0.74	201
Kingston Upon Hull	26.06	26	14.5	11	44.91	24	18.18	22
Leicester	24.95	32	14.0	18	48.48	20	12.95	35
Luton	16.34	72	11.0	66	23.83	54	10.29	45
Medway Towns	8.04	124	10.9	67	13.02	84	4.74	84
Middlesbrough	26.41	24	12.8	37	53.55	18	22.26	12
Milton Keynes	2.41	219	8.1	135	9.96	101	2.77	124
Newbury	2.15	227	3.1	269	0.00	158=	0.36	245

1998 Index of Local Deprivation

DISTRICT NAME	Degree score	Degree Rank	Average worst 3 wards	Ward Intensity (Rank)	% LA population in worst 10% wards	Ward Extent (Rank)	% EDs in Worst 7%	ED Extent (Rank)
North East Lincolnshire	16.20	73	10.2	80	16.85	87	7.77	35
North Lincolnshire	9.77	111	8.7	116	2.43	156	3.55	111
North Somerset	1.83	281	7.8	150	4.98	144	1.40	287
Nottingham	28.44	16	13.8	21	41.30	29	18.94	19
Peterborough	6.73	135	11.5	56	10.50	97	8.39	74
Plymouth	13.88	83	13.2	31	19.00	66	8.35	56
Poole	.90	281	3.8	240	0.00	158	0.00	200
Portsmouth	15.88	75	11.8	51	32.52	41	8.84	53
Reading	9.54	112	10.7	68	20.50	84	6.07	78
Redcar and Cleveland	21.54	43	11.9	49	13.47	81	10.63	44
Rutland	.00	310	1.8	350	0.00	158	0.00	253
Slough	11.75	100	8.0	141	6.85	124	4.31	92
South Gloucestershire	.78	287	3.8	238	0.00	158	0.00	253
Southampton	15.70	78	12.1	46	31.14	45	8.15	58
Southend-on-Sea	10.77	104	8.5	120	6.52	128	2.37	137
Stockton-on-Tees	20.41	49	11.9	50	24.90	52	11.51	38
Stoke-on-Trent	20.61	48	11.2	60	23.17	55	6.28	61
Swindon	2.12	231	9.4	103	10.43	98	1.14	180
The Wrekin	12.41	82	8.2	133	0.00	158	1.84	163
Thurrock	12.11	95	8.1	134	9.12	109	4.44	91
Torbay	11.88	97	8.5	124	8.80	115	4.20	93
Warrington	7.44	128	10.3	77	11.07	92	2.95	122
Windsor and Maidenhead	2.42	217	2.7	308	0.00	158	0.38	241
Wokingham	.00	310	2.8	298	0.00	158	0.00	253
York	.00	310	7.8	148	0.00	158	1.19	178

Regeneration Summary no. 15

Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London SW1P 5DU
Telephone 0171 890 3000
Internet service - <http://www.detr.gov.uk/>

Published by the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions.

© Crown Copyright 1998.

Extracts of this publication may be made for non-commercial in-house use, subject to the source being acknowledged.
Applications for reproduction should be made in writing to The Copyright Unit, Her Majesty's Stationery Office,
St Clement's House, 1-16 Colegate, Norwich NR3 1BQ

Reprinted in the UK July 1998 on paper comprising 75% post consumer waste
and 25% ECF pulp (Cover). 100% post consumer waste (Text).

Product code C7826.