

THE CONDITION OF NOTTINGHAMSHIRE

SECTION 1



*Building
a Future*



COMMENTARY

& OVERVIEW

THE COUNTY COUNCIL AND CONDITION OF NOTTINGHAMSHIRE

This fifth edition of Condition of Nottinghamshire once again follows the priorities in the County Council's Strategic Plan, Building a Future; these priorities are; Learning; Social Care and Health; Culture; Regeneration; Environment; Community. As in the fourth edition, Condition of Nottinghamshire gives a range of indicators under each of the above, updating much of the data covered in previous editions.

Again, as in the fourth edition, much of the data presented is given at district and borough and at ward levels. It is however, important to note that since the last edition was published there have been major changes to electoral geography and to ward boundaries across Nottinghamshire. This makes comparing progress at a local level since 2002 difficult.

District boundaries have however, remained constant and this does allow comparison of relative progress on common indicators between this and previous editions.

THE NATIONAL CONTEXT

Since the last edition of Condition of Nottinghamshire was published, the full results of the 2001 Census have become available. This has meant that it has been possible to update several indicators and many denominators. In addition, the trend noted previously of information and data being made available at a much more local, small area level, has continued. This trend, which was recognised by government in its development of Neighbourhood Statistics, has become more marked through the development of several more services and web sites enabling access to a far wider range of data, generally at a more local level than previously.

A further development has been a marked improvement in the level of detail available for smaller geographical levels. Two to three years ago the smallest areas for which many statistics were available was the electoral ward. Now however, many statistics are being made available or are being disaggregated to the Super Output Area (SOA) level. This geography, which was first extensively used in the construction of the 2001 Census and the dissemination of its results, enables a much finer grained examination of localities.

The increasing focus on performance measurement and management has also meant that several new services whose primary function or purpose is the measurement of relative performance, have been made more widely available and can be useful in evaluating context or relative service delivery. Such services include Floor Targets Interactive and certain parts of Neighbourhood Statistics both available via www.neighbourhood.gov.uk

Floor Targets Interactive (FTI) is a web-based system for monitoring progress towards Public Service Agreement Floor Targets. FTI enables users to examine local authority performance on a range of indicators, ranking performance against national, regional and local comparators.

The data underpinning the system has been brought together from across Government to provide a single resource for users. FTI allows users to interrogate the data to produce a range of analyses and illustrative maps.

Where it is available, data going back to 1997 has been included on FTI. The system covers all English local authorities down to district level but there is a detailed focus on the 88 local authorities that receive Neighbourhood Renewal Fund.

CENSUS OF POPULATION 2001

The 2001 Census results have been published in full, and are available on National Statistics web sites. They are available for many levels of geography, from national to Output Area (about 150 households).

Output areas are the elements upon which Super Output Area geography is built. Census results have been used in deriving some Condition indicators where other data (such as migration rates) are unavailable. However, population estimates have been revised using Census data, as well as other denominators that are unavailable in intervening years.

One of the principal areas where Census data has input to knowledge about the county are, as mentioned above, population estimates, - the estimates for all districts have been rebased using the 2001 Census, and ONS ward population estimates have recently been produced on an experimental basis; these will replace estimates previously used by the Research Team.

Census data has been used to produce district and ward profiles, giving some 100+ indicators for comparison; Parish profiles are currently being produced. Outside bodies have prepared classifications based on the Census. These include ONS's own Area classification that goes down to Output Area level, as well as being produced for wards and districts. Private companies such as Experian (Mosaic) and CACI (Acorn) have their own classifications, which also utilise non-Census data; both are used within the authority. Many other areas of work such as resource allocation, funding bids and profiling in relation to equalities and other service delivery analysis have benefited from Census data. Analysis by the County Council of Census data has covered ethnic groups and travel to work, plus more generic analysis, all available on the Council's web site www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk

INDICES OF DEPRIVATION 2004

In 2004, the Government published the latest version of the Indices of Deprivation (ID), following an intensive investigation of the available data. The ID 2004 was made available at an SOA level rather than at a ward level as was the case in 2000. The data covers seven 'Domains', each of which has several component indicators; the domains are; Income Deprivation; Employment Deprivation; Health Deprivation and Disability; Education, Skills and Training; Barriers to Housing and Services; Crime;

Living Environment; several of these domains also have sub-domains.

The results of the ID 2004 show that the District level results have changed, in some cases substantially, since the IMD 2000 was compiled and released. The table below shows these changes;

Districts	IMD 2000	ID 2004
Ashfield	31	66
Bassetlaw	74	82
Broxtowe	219	194
Gedling	197	184
Mansfield	29	33
Newark & Sherwood	143	143
Rushcliffe	320	309
Nottingham	12	7

Although these changes may be important in terms of affecting areas' access to government funding to tackle deprivation, (for example the change for Ashfield may mean that the district may not now be able to access Neighbourhood Renewal Funding), due to changes in the way in which the later ID was compiled, they should not be viewed as areas getting better or worse over time.

As indicated above, the changes in the detail at which statistics become available is also marked in the ID 2004. The IMD 2000 used wards as its main building block (there were slightly over 8,000 wards in England). The ID 2004 uses SOAs, of which there are over 32,000 in England.

In terms of the results, under the ID 2004, there are 30 Nottinghamshire SOAs in the most deprived 10% of English SOAs and 110 in the most deprived 25% of English SOAs.

Map D1 shows the overall results of the ID 2004 as they apply across the county, with colours showing the most deprived 10% and 25%. The map shows that deprivation is concentrated in Mansfield and Worksop, with more distributed need found in Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Sutton-in-Ashfield, Carlton in Lindrick, Boughton and Hucknall. Less serious need is clustered in the same areas but can also be seen in western Bassetlaw, in several parts of Retford and Newark,

north west Newark and Sherwood and also in the greater Nottingham area, in some SOAs in Eastwood, Arnold, Netherfield, Chilwell and Stapleford.

When the component parts of the ID 2004 are examined, different patterns emerge. One of the important domains is Education, Skills and Training which includes a variety of indicators covering skill and qualification levels for children, young people and adults. **Map D2** shows the Education, Skills and Training domain of the ID 2004 as it applies across the county. Comparing this map with D1 shows that the north west of the county still has need under this domain but that much larger areas of Mansfield, Ashfield and eastern Bassetlaw as well as north west Newark and Sherwood are also covered. In addition, pockets of need can also be seen in Broxtowe, Gedling and Rushcliffe. The table which underpins this map shows that under this domain, 60 Nottinghamshire SOAs fall within the most deprived 10% of English SOAs and 150 fall within the most deprived 25%.

It is also important to remember that since receiving criticisms that earlier IDs emphasised the problems of urban areas and failed to take account of rural issues, the government has attempted to address this by building in more indicators which reflect sparsity of services. The Barriers to Housing and Services domain does this for the ID 2004. The domain covers housing conditions and the presence or absence of services such as primary schools, post offices, supermarkets and doctors' surgeries.

Map D3 shows that problems of access to services as identified under this domain of the ID 2004 are concentrated in the rural east of the county, on both sides of the Trent valley, with other areas also having problems including Welbeck and Sutton wards in Bassetlaw and Wolds, Neville and Thoroton in Rushcliffe.

COUNTYWIDE CONTEXT

As noted in the last edition of Condition of Nottinghamshire, the countywide agenda has grown in recent years, with the emergence of more agencies having a countywide remit. These include the Learning and Skills Council (LSC), Connexions and the

Nottinghamshire Research Observatory. The research and data activities of the above, now joined with those of Jobcentre Plus, which has most recently changed to a countywide agency, enables partners to understand the shape of the county much better than was the case only a few years ago. The LSC for example has researched the skill needs of sectors of the local economy and has published a series of documents reporting on these.

Jupiter in Nottinghamshire (JiN) is a further important initiative which has come fully on stream in the last twelve months. JiN has a primary objective to promote data sharing and the use of geographical information systems to improve information provision on community safety issues and therefore to enhance the work of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships across the county. Partners in this work include the County Council, Nottingham City Council, Nottinghamshire Police, Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service, the Government Office for the East Midlands and Ashfield District Council. Whilst the primary emphasis of JiN is on community safety, other related issues such as fires, fly tipping, hospital admissions and so on are now being built into the work programme. The JiN website outlines the scope of the project and can be accessed at www.jinpartnership.org.uk

In health, the **East Midlands Public Health Observatory (EMPHO)** has begun to do some good work on patterns of health and inequalities across the region but also more focused work within the county. Publications include Key Health Indicators and Health of Children in the East Midlands. The EMPHO website is accessible via www.empho.org.uk

The Local Futures company has been undertaking a lot of work in the county in recent months. Products released in the last year include the economic audit of the North Derbyshire and North Nottinghamshire Sub-Regional Strategic Partnership, a similar investigation of the Nottingham City area and more recently **The State of the County; an economic, social and environmental audit of Nottinghamshire**, which was published in March 2005, accompanied by subsidiary audits of each of the county's districts and boroughs. This work gives a view of the state of the county and its constituent parts, with rankings of their

position against regional and national averages.

In 2004, the City and County Councils co-operated to compile and publish the latest edition of **Social Need in Nottinghamshire**. This publication, the fourth in the series, uses statistics drawn from the 2001 Census but also from both City and County Local Education Authorities and social services departments, Nottinghamshire Police, health organisations and so on, to collect information on 22 indicators, broken down into 380 zones across the county and giving a detailed view of need and the correlations between the components of social need. Social Need in Nottinghamshire can be accessed via www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/socialneedstudy

Nottinghamshire Knowledge is a new service commissioned by Nottinghamshire County Council in response to calls made by partners for greater co-operation and exchange of knowledge on the state of communities in the county.

The system, which is wholly web based, enables users to map, compare, rank and profile areas, using over 400 indicators. The main strength of the system is in its coverage of economic indicators but it also covers social and environmental issues. The route to gain access is via; <http://notts.localknowledge.co.uk>, the username is notts@localfutures.com and the password is notts.

CONDITION OF NOTTINGHAMSHIRE 2005

As referred to above, Condition of Nottinghamshire once again mirrors the priorities in the Strategic Plan. Under each of the six priorities, a range of indicators - 48 in all - each showing actual figures on the position of each district, together with a ranking showing their position relative to each other, on a scale of one to seven. Wherever possible, statistics are also given for each ward in the district, and where these figures are available, a ranking showing their position relative to each other.

In almost every case, where ward details are given, these data have also been mapped so that a countywide picture can be seen on a single page. Each of these maps shows the county with the district ward boundaries. Colours indicate which wards are

significantly above and below the county average in terms of their performance under the indicator. Significant difference is defined as being more than one standard deviation above or below the average for the county.

In several cases, there are instances where the position of certain wards is very significantly different from the county average and in these cases this has been noted on the maps by their designation as 'extreme'. In these cases the extreme values have been excluded from the calculation of mean and standard deviation used in the classification on the maps. As is the case for each ward, the actual position in terms of performance can be gauged by referring to the accompanying tables.

There are transparent overlays contained in the pocket within the back cover. These can be placed over the maps to enable readers less familiar with the geography of the county to put district ward names to the areas on each maps and also to show the boundaries of County Council electoral divisions.

This edition of Condition covers 48 indicators and 3 maps from the Indices of Deprivation 2004. As noted above, the changes to ward boundaries that have taken place since the last edition was published mean that it is less possible to make comparisons over time but the following narrative draws out lessons where this is possible and useful.



Population

A population profile for the county showing a breakdown by district and age is shown below. The table shows that, as in previous years, all Nottinghamshire districts and boroughs have very similar population totals. In 2001 they ranged between 106,000 and 112,000, apart from Mansfield which had a population of 98,000. In terms of age profile, particular items to note include a large percentage of very young people in Ashfield, a large percentage of school aged children and young adults in Mansfield, a small percentage aged between retirement and 74 years in Ashfield and a large percentage aged 75 years or more in Newark and Sherwood.

Demography of the County

Local Authority District	2001		Age Group as a percentage of District total (2001)							
	Popn estimate	% of County	0-4	5-10	11-15	16-24	25-44	45-ret	ret-74	75+
Ashfield	111,400	14.9	5.9	7.8	6.6	9.8	29.3	22.4	10.8	7.5
Bassetlaw	107,700	14.4	5.6	7.7	6.6	9.4	28.3	23.4	11.6	7.3
Broxtowe	107,600	14.4	5.1	7.4	6.3	9.9	29.4	22.9	11.4	7.6
Gedling	111,800	14.9	5.3	7.3	6.5	9.3	28.7	23.5	11.7	7.9
Mansfield	98,200	13.1	5.5	8.1	7.0	10.2	28.4	21.9	11.4	7.6
Newark and Sherwood	106,300	14.2	5.6	7.8	6.6	9.1	27.4	23.5	11.9	8.1
Rushcliffe	105,600	14.1	5.6	7.6	6.2	9.7	29.0	23.2	11.0	7.7
County	748,500	100.0	5.5	7.7	6.5	9.6	28.6	23.0	11.4	7.7

LEARNING

Unlike the last edition of Condition of Nottinghamshire, where it was not possible to map results under the Learning priority due to the lack of data below district level, this edition covers seven indicators, all of which have details at ward level and all of which have been mapped.

Special Educational Need figures show high levels of SEN in Mansfield and Ashfield. There are major disparities within the districts and these are most marked in Ashfield where rates range from 9.4% in Underwood to 32.2 % in Kirkby-in-Ashfield East and in Newark and Sherwood, with rates ranging from 4.9% in Trent ward to 31.9% in Devon. The county's average of 14.9% is slightly lower than that for the country - 15.9%. **Map L1** shows a distributed pattern across the county with clusters of need in central Newark and west Mansfield.

Key Stage 2 English and Maths (Maps L2 and L3) show different distributions. Wards showing poorer performance in both subjects at KS 2 include those clustered in west Mansfield and west Bassetlaw, with outliers in Brinsley, Misterton, Ollerton and Boughton. In terms of districts, Mansfield has the poorest performance. It should be noted that the county as a whole outperforms the national average by almost 6% in English and almost 7% in terms of maths.

At **Key Stage 3**, Mansfield and Bassetlaw record the worst figures but once again the county average is better than that for the country - 6% in the case of English and almost 3% in Maths. **Maps L4 and L5** show a different picture from Key Stage 2, with several Retford wards and Gedling and Rushcliffe wards appearing.

The 2 GCSE indicators, **5 A - Cs** and **No GCSEs**, when mapped, **(L6 and L7)**, show dissimilar pictures. Whilst there are some areas which are common, - Worksop East and South East, Sutton-in-Ashfield North, Pleasley Hill, Meden and Ravensdale in Mansfield, Bridge and Devon in Newark and Killisick in Gedling, the map showing No Passes also includes Winthorpe, Everton, East Markham, Trent (Rushcliffe) and Lambley, as performing relatively poorly.

Taking the Learning indicators as a whole, Rushcliffe has the best performance on all seven and Mansfield the worst on five of the seven. In terms of the no GCSEs indicator, Bassetlaw performs poorly but it is also important to note that the average county rate of 2.3% is markedly better than the national average of 4.1%.

SOCIAL CARE & HEALTH

There are 11 indicators in all under this priority, 9 of which have details at a ward level and all of these have been mapped. It is interesting to note that **Low Birth Weight Babies (Map S1)** shows that this seems to be concentrated in rural rather than urban areas of the county, with the exception of five wards in Mansfield, Sutton-in-Ashfield Central, Rainworth, Attenborough and Trowell in Broxtowe, St James in Gedling and two wards in Newark. The other wards which stand out are the large rural wards in Bassetlaw and Newark and Sherwood. Some of these patterns may be due to the relatively small numbers of births in some of these areas, even though the rates may seem high.

Income support statistics reflect low pay; **Map S2** shows a concentration of high percentages in Mansfield, together with a cluster of wards in each of Ashfield and Newark. Mansfield has the worst performance under this indicator, followed by Ashfield and Bassetlaw. It should however be noted that the County average is lower than both the regional and national averages.

Map S3 shows concentrations of **Lone Parents** in receipt of **lone parent premium** as a percentage of all Income Support claimants and shows a more dispersed picture, with wards in each district including for example Keyworth South, Cotgrave and Bingham West in Rushcliffe, four wards in Gedling including Newstead and Phoenix and three in Broxtowe including Chilwell West and two Stapleford wards. Again the overall county performance is slightly better than the regional and national averages.

Poverty is an important indicator and uses as a proxy the percentage of 5-15 year olds receiving **Free School Meals**. **Map S4** shows a marked concentration in Mansfield, north west Bassetlaw and central Newark. The highest rates are in Mansfield Ravensdale (37%) and Worksop South East (39.4%).

The three maps (**S5, S6 and S7**) showing 'In Need', focus on **Elderly in Need, Children in Need** and **Disabled People in Need** in turn and show some commonality, with clusters of wards in Ashfield, Mansfield and Newark, with some outliers in Clipstone, Retford and Broxtowe. On both the Disabled in Need and Elderly in Need measures there are two wards in West Bridgford, and an Elderly in Need cluster in Southwell. Both Gedling and Rushcliffe perform best under these three indicators and the county average is 3% better than the national average under Elderly in Need.

Child Protection (Map S8) shows a distributed pattern and the accompanying table shows that Ashfield, Mansfield and Newark and Sherwood have the highest rates of referral of 0-17 year olds.

Drug Treatment is a new indicator using statistics collected by the Nottinghamshire Drug and Alcohol Action Team. It is important to note that this is not a measure of drug misuse but of the number of people receiving treatment for drug abuse. Once again **Map S9** shows a concentration in west Bassetlaw and Mansfield and significant pockets in Greater Nottingham - Eastwood, Cossall and Kimberley, Stapleford North and Netherfield and Colwick as well as a cluster to the north of Nottingham - four Hucknall wards, Newstead, Calverton and four wards in Newark. The highest rates in the county are in Worksop South East (14%) and Mansfield Ravensdale (11%).

Neither **Mortality** nor **Housing Stress** have details at ward level. The tables show the worst problems by far in terms of the former in Ashfield, followed by Mansfield (with Newark and Sherwood and Rushcliffe, Broxtowe and Gedling having better mortality rates than England and Wales).

In terms of Housing Stress, Mansfield is the only part of the county exhibiting significant stress - almost

three times higher than Ashfield, Bassetlaw and Gedling.

C U L T U R E

None of the culture indicators is available at a ward level and all cover aspects of library services. The table however shows that enquiries continue to run at a healthy rate although there has been a slight reduction since 2000/01. The pattern of library visits has changed since the last edition of Condition, with Newark and Sherwood now topping the county league, whereas Ashfield did in 2000/01. The pattern of issues per head has fallen slightly from 7.2 per head in 2000/01 to 6.7 per head now.

R E G E N E R A T I O N

There are seven indicators, matching those in the last edition and four of these are mapped. As in the last edition, the hopeful signs of regeneration in Mansfield as shown by the **Enterprise** indicator are even more emphatic this time, with the good performance of Broxtowe, Newark and Sherwood and Ashfield contributing to a better countywide performance than that of the region and the country in 2002/03.

There are more mixed messages however in **Employment Change** even though the period covered is only one year; once again Mansfield performs well under this indicator as does Newark and Sherwood but other areas experience significant negative employment change, contributing to a disappointing result for the county.

There are three measures of **unemployment**. Unemployment statistics show that the County rate has halved since the last edition of Condition of Nottinghamshire was published and is now significantly below the regional and national rate. **Map R1** shows a skew to the north west of the county, but other areas experiencing higher rates include wards in Retford, Newark, Hucknall, Eastwood and Killisick in Gedling. The highest district rates are in Mansfield and Ashfield and the highest ward rate is in Mansfield Ravensdale.

A very similar picture emerges when **Youth Unemployment** is examined (**Map R2**), with the addition of other Worksop wards, Welbeck, a further Retford ward, with the highest rate being in Ashfield. The highest district rate is in Mansfield, four times higher than the district rate for Rushcliffe.

The **Long Term Unemployment** indicator (**Map R3**) shows a different picture from the previous two unemployment indicators with many Mansfield, north west Bassetlaw and Ashfield wards not appearing under this heading. This may be a result of the focus getting on long term unemployed people back into work by the government's successive New Deal programmes. Instead of the usual pattern, other wards - Misterton and Beckingham, Selston and Jacksdale, Awsworth and Chilwell West and a group of wards in Arnold stand out.

Migration (Map R4), shows those areas which gained or lost population during 2000/01. The results show large differences with Ashfield showing a substantial increase, but Broxtowe, Gedling and Mansfield showing decreases. The largest ward decreases were in Underwood and Pleasley Hill and the largest increases in Sutton, Bingham East, Trent Bridge and Sutton-in-Ashfield West.

As a total of **Employment Land** identified in 1993, Ashfield and Broxtowe have taken up the largest proportion up to 2003. Newark and Sherwood continues to have the lowest proportion, well below the other districts.

E N V I R O N M E N T

There are seven indicators this time as opposed to 5 in the last edition, but none is available at a ward level and therefore none is mapped.

There are three categories of road accident figures instead of one as in the last edition. The numbers of **Killed and Seriously Injured in Road Accidents** shows that the highest numbers are in Newark and Sherwood and Rushcliffe and the lowest in Broxtowe and Gedling.

The numbers of **Children Killed and Seriously Injured** shows a different picture with the highest numbers being in Ashfield and the lowest in Bassetlaw; the pattern of **All Slight Road Accidents** shows that Gedling and Mansfield have relatively good records but that once again Newark and Sherwood, followed by Bassetlaw, have high numbers.

The **Reuse of Land for Employment and Housing** are both very similar to that shown in the last edition in terms of the overall county percentage and in terms of the district ranking. Once again, Broxtowe has the best results in terms of reuse of land for employment and housing.

The **House Building** statistics show that in terms of numbers built in 2003-04 as a percentage of total dwellings, the highest rate by far was in Newark and Sherwood, followed by Ashfield; the lowest rate was in Broxtowe.

In terms of **Bus Satisfaction**, the highest rates recorded in 2003/04 were in Rushcliffe, closely followed by Broxtowe, whilst the lowest satisfaction rates were in Newark and Sherwood and Mansfield.

C O M M U N I T Y

There are 11 indicators under this priority as opposed to 8 in the last edition. Seven of these cover aspects of crime and community safety and many of these mirror the indicators in the last edition. There are also two new indicators dealing with incidence of fires.

Youth Crime (Map C1) rates have fallen between 2000 and 2004/05. Bassetlaw has the highest rates and Rushcliffe the lowest. The ward breakdown and the associated map, shows particular hotspots in Worksop South East, with a rate four times higher than the next highest Bassetlaw ward, and in Castle ward in Newark, with clusters in west Bassetlaw, Mansfield and Newark and several distributed wards in Broxtowe and Gedling and in Tuxford & Trent in Bassetlaw.

Domestic Burglaries conversely have increased in number over the same 2000 to 2003/04 period. The county average of 26.9 per 1000 households is

significantly higher than the rate for the country of 16 per 1000 households. The district breakdown once again shows a similar pattern to that shown in the last edition with Ashfield having the highest rate (38.3 per 1000 households and Newark and Sherwood the lowest (14 per 1000). The ward breakdown (**Map C2**) again shows local concentrations with a particularly high rate in one Ashfield ward - Kirkby-in-Ashfield East, having a rate of 104.6 per 1000 households, double the rate of the next worst, which are also in Kirkby-in-Ashfield. The map shows Mansfield and Ashfield having clusters of wards with high rates; much of Hucknall also has a worse performance under this indicator, as do many Broxtowe wards and 2 in each of Gedling and West Bridgford.

Violence Against the Person (Map C3) figures show Mansfield having high rates and Rushcliffe the lowest. The ward breakdown and accompanying map shows very high concentrations in three wards in central Mansfield - especially Sherwood, followed by Portland and Ravensdale, and Castle ward in Newark. Other wards recording poor performance under this indicator include a cluster of five wards in west Bassetlaw, two in Retford, three in Ashfield, a further three in Mansfield and a scattering in Greater Nottingham, with most in Gedling. Under this indicator, the county rate is significantly better than the rate for the country as a whole.

Whereas in the last edition vehicle crime was one indicator, in this edition this earlier indicator has been split into **Theft from Vehicles** and **Theft of Vehicles**. Under the former, Mansfield has the highest rate of all Nottinghamshire districts, almost double the rate of the district with the lowest rate, Newark and Sherwood. There are no wards with extreme rates under this indicator but concentrations can be seen from **Map C4** in central Mansfield, south east Bassetlaw and in wards in Broxtowe and West Bridgford and to some extent in those areas of Gedling bordering on Nottingham City.

Theft of Vehicles (Map C5) shows the worst district in the county to be Gedling, closely followed by Bassetlaw and the best to be Rushcliffe and Newark and Sherwood. The county rate is slightly higher than the rate for the country. The map shows the

distribution by ward, with no extremes, but with clusters in west Bassetlaw and Mansfield and in several wards to the north of Nottingham, particularly in north Gedling.

Criminal Damage figures show that Bassetlaw and Mansfield have the highest percentages. **Map C6** shows clusters of wards in south Worksop, central Mansfield and eastern Ashfield as well as in central Newark, with outliers in several wards in Greater Nottingham, Retford and Cotgrave.

Total Recorded Crime figures show that in terms of districts, Mansfield has the worst record in the county, followed by Bassetlaw and Ashfield. **Map C7** shows the highest ward rates are in Worksop South, Portland and Sherwood wards in Mansfield and Castle in Newark.

The new indicators charting the location and frequency of dwelling fires are interesting; the figures on **Accidental Dwelling Fires (Map C8)** show that Bassetlaw and Mansfield have the highest rates. In terms of wards, Worksop South East has by far the highest rate - 38 per 1000 households. Again there are some significant clusters, in west Bassetlaw and in much of Mansfield, in north Ashfield and Hucknall wards and in some Greater Nottingham wards. The **Dwelling Fires with Casualties** indicator is also interesting although the numbers involved are small. **Map C9** shows that there is a particularly high number in Welbeck ward in Bassetlaw and Magnus in Newark but that these only amount to 2.2 and 1.5 per 1000 households respectively; the map also shows clusters of incidents in Mansfield and West Bridgford.

Teenage Pregnancy (Map C10) figures show marked disparities, with district figures ranging from 53.5 per 1000 of the total population of 15-17 year olds in Ashfield to 17.0 per thousand in Rushcliffe in the period 2000 to 2002, with high rates in Mansfield and Bassetlaw. The lower rates in other districts make the county rate of 37.7 per thousand lower than both that for the region and the country. The ward breakdown shows particular peaks in Kirkby-in-Ashfield East and in several Sutton-in-Ashfield wards, in several Worksop wards and Carlton-in-Lindrick, in Killisick, Valley and Netherfield & Colwick in Gedling,

Ravensdale, Pleasley Hill and Lindhurst in Mansfield and Clipstone in Newark and Sherwood.

The **Democratic Participation (Map C11)** rate shows rates of voting in recent local elections, with district rates ranging from below 27% in Ashfield and Mansfield to 54.2% in Rushcliffe. Clusters of lower level voting patterns include those in Worksop, Mansfield, Sutton-in-Ashfield, Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Ollerton and Boughton. Netherfield & Colwick is the only ward in Greater Nottingham recording a rate classified as worse than average. It should also be noted that several wards have no details as they were uncontested.