## Equality Impact Needs Assessment



| Title | Exploring the options for the reorganisation of local authorities in Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset |
| :--- | :--- |
| Service(s) under analysis | All functions and services provided by all nine Dorset councils: Borough of Poole, Bournemouth Borough <br> Council, Christchurch Borough Council, Dorset County Council, East Dorset District Council, North Dorset <br> District Council, , Purbeck District Council, West Dorset District Council and Weymouth and Portland <br> Borough Council. |
|  | Chief Executives of all nine councils <br> Borough of Poole (BoP) - Andrew Flockhart <br> Bournemouth Borough Council (BBC) - Tony Williams <br> Christchurch and East Dorset Partnership (CEDP) - David McIntosh <br> Dorset County Council (DCCC) - Debbie Ward <br> North Dorset District Council, West Dorset District Council and Weymouth \& Portland Borough Council <br> (DCP) - Matt Prosser <br> Purbeck District Council (PDC) - Steve Mackenzie |
| Leansponsle Officers |  |
| Members of the Assessment | Beverly Elliott - Organisational Development Co-ordinator(CEDP) <br> Daniel Biggs - Strategic Communities and Equalities Officer (BoP) <br> Rebecca Murphy - Research and Policy Officer (DCC) <br> Sem Johnson - Equality and Diversity Manager (BBC) <br> Sue Joyce - General Manager Resources (PDC) <br> Susan Ward-Rice - Community Development Team Leader (DCP) |

## Date assessment started:

Date assessment completed:

```
\(27^{\text {th }}\) October 2016
\(15^{\text {th }}\) December 2016
```


## About the Policy/Service/Project:

## Type of policy

The potential to re-organise the structure of local government in Dorset will affect all nine existing councils.
This Equality Impact Needs Assessment (EINA) considers the high-level equality implications of the 4 potential local government reorganisation options in Dorset that have been subject to consultation. It is for each of the Dorset councils to take strategic policy decisions based on their understanding of the quality and sustainability of each option. This EINA forms part of the evidence pack from which councils will review the considerations that emerge from the public consultation report, financial analysis and wider case for change. If the decision to move to 2 unitary authorities is taken, a change of such magnitude will undoubtedly impact on service delivery and by association impact residents, communities and members of staff. The merits of the various options must pay 'due regard' to the equality impacts of any decision formed as the basis for future public policy.

Option 1 has been referred to as the no change option, as the number of councils and the areas covered by them will not change, however, it is clear that this option would also require significant transformational change in order to deliver the level of budget cuts required over the coming years. This EINA has not focused on this option as the existing organisations already have in place their own equality processes and will address each potential policy change as appropriate. At this stage the EINA has focused on Options 2a, 2b and 2c, which have the potential to change the number of councils from 9 , down to 2 unitary councils, with resulting changes to the geographical areas covered by the new organisations. The EINA has focused on very high level potential impacts resulting from: the changes to the areas covered by each of the councils, which will change the demographic make up to the communities each unitary will be serving; the potential impact of moving from two tiers of local councils to one; and some potential transformational changes.

## Conclusion of this review

PWC's case for change report and Opinion Research Services' (ORS) consultation report do not present any issues which would be considered unlawful from an equalities perspective.

The equalities group have undertaken a very high level assessment of potential equality impacts that might result from adoption of Options $2 a$, 2 b or 2 c and again have not identified any issues which would be considered unlawful from an equalities perspective.

As nothing has been identified as potentially unlawful the equalities duty has been met.

## What are the aims/ objectives of the policy

The proposed options for change to council structures is intended to provide a sustainable model that is most effective to deliver services in line with the reducing funding levels year on year.

The current configuration of councils under a No Change scenario are projected to have aggregate budget gaps in each of the years from 2019/20 to 2024/25 which would require total savings of approximately $£ 30 \mathrm{~m}$ to be found.

There is the potential to save annually circa $£ 28$ million by the creation of two unitary councils.
It should also be noted that bringing services together under unitary authorities can be expected to present opportunities to remodel services to produce transformational savings that might not otherwise be achievable. ${ }^{1}$

Four options were considered: Option 1 no change; and Options $2 \mathrm{a}, 2 \mathrm{~b}$, and 2 c based on the creation of two unitary councils.
The consultation information produced by ORS sets out the following key features of each option
Option 1 - No change
This option does not require an EINA as it will not result in any changes to existing policies as an immediate outcome to the decision about the future shape of local government in Dorset.

Option 2A - Large Conurbation (LC) ${ }^{2}$

## KEY FEATURES:

- This option would provide a total contribution of $£ 39.6$ million towards meeting the 6 year cumulative funding gap by 2024/25, providing $£ 62.9$ million for the Large Conurbation’s 6 year cumulative budget gap but creating a $£ 23.3$ million deficit in the Small Dorset's 6 year cumulative budget.
- A large urban unitary council would be financially viable, with a high national profile, however there may be significant challenges to the Small Dorset unitary council.
- The population in the Small Dorset unitary $(286,400)$ is lower than the government guidelines $(400,000$ to 600,000$)$ for an efficiently-functioning unitary council.
- There is a one-off complexity and cost involved in separating and transferring services currently provided by Dorset County Council in Christchurch and East Dorset to the Large Conurbation.

Option 2B - Medium Conurbation (MC)
KEY FEATURES:

[^0]- This option would provide a total contribution of $£ 46.7$ million towards meeting the 6 year cumulative funding gap by 2024/25, providing $£ 45.3$ million for the Medium Conurbation's 6 year cumulative budget gap and $£ 1.4$ million for the Medium Dorset's 6 year cumulative budget.
- Of the various two-unitary options this is the option that is most financially beneficial.
- Most of Dorset's urban and suburban areas are served by one council, with the largely rural area served by another council.
- This option potentially provides the most effective and efficient way to deliver services for the future.
- This option has the most balanced population split of the three options.
- A medium-sized urban unitary council would have a profile nationally.
- There is a one off complexity and cost involved in separating and transferring services currently provided by Dorset County Council in Christchurch to the Medium Conurbation and for East Dorset District Council and Christchurch Borough Council in separating and transferring services currently provided jointly between the Medium Dorset and the Medium Conurbation.


## Option 2C - Small Conurbation (SC)

## KEY FEATURES:

- This option would provide a total contribution of $£ 32.8$ million towards meeting the 6 year cumulative funding gap by 2024/25, providing $£ 18.7$ million for the Small Conurbation's 6 year cumulative budget gap and $£ 14.1$ million for the Large Dorset's 6 year cumulative budget.
- It makes the least savings overall, of the three two-unitary council options.
- The savings made are most evenly split across the two unitary councils.
- The services currently provided by Dorset County Council remain with the Large Dorset unitary council - there is no separation work required, but services provided by the district, borough and county councils would need to be integrated into the new unitary council.
Associated services, policies and procedures
If a decision is taken to restructure from 9 councils to 2 unitary councils in Dorset, existing policies of all the nine councils in Dorset will potentially be replaced by the policies of the new authorities created from re-organisation.

The reshaping of councils in Dorset has the potential to impact all residents, service users, staff, councillors and visitors
All businesses, statutory, voluntary and community organisations could also be impacted by the reorganisation of Dorset's councils

## Consultation:

Public consultation on the proposals for change started on 30 August and closed on 25 October 2016. This consultation was available to the public, staff and organisations. ORS was appointed by Dorset's councils to provide an independent report of the formal programme of work that forms part of the Reshaping your Councils consultation on the possible reconfiguration of council services in Dorset. The document dorset-councils-ors-on-interpreting-the-consultation-findings summarises ORS's approach in that role. ${ }^{3}$

In the Reshaping your Councils consultation ORS looked to capture a range of different responses from individuals and organisations as a result of the following activities:

- The Open Consultation Questionnaire available on-line, with paper copies in council reception areas, local libraries and on road shows;
- The Household Postal Survey;
- A town and parish council survey;
- Resident forums recruited and facilitated by ORS in each of the local authority areas in Dorset;
- 16 facilitated workshops with residents, business and voluntary sector representatives and parish/town councillors;
- 42 roadshows held across Dorset at different times of the day and different days of the week, including Saturdays, staffed by councillors, communications staff, finance staff and other senior staff; and
- Written responses and petitions.

The household survey was sent to a representative sample of the Dorset population. 20,000 addresses were selected at random from all addresses in each of Dorset's local authority areas. 4,258 residents responded ( $5 \%$ online and $95 \%$ postal). The household survey responses have been statistically weighted to take account of the size of the population in each local authority area and different response rates for different types of households. This ensures that the household survey results are statistically reliable and representative of the whole population in each area.

The open consultation questionnaire gave all Dorset residents and other stakeholders the chance to have their say; and a total of $\mathbf{1 2 , 5 3 6}$ responses were received ( $85 \%$ online and $15 \%$ postal).

From the household survey and the open consultation questionnaire a total of $\mathbf{1 6 , 7 9 4}$ responses were received.
ORS have prepared an independent analysis taking into account all of the responses and the report was available from $5^{\text {th }}$ December 2016. ORS set out to highlight findings, for example where they may be:

- Relevant;
- Well evidenced;
- Representative of the general population or specific localities;

[^1]- Deliberative - based on thoughtful discussion in public meetings and other informed dialogue;
- Focused on views from under-represented people or equality groups; and
- 'Novel' - in the sense of raising 'different' issues to those being repeated by a number of respondents or arising from a different perspective.

ORS also aimed to identify where strength of feeling may be particularly intense while recognising that interpreting consultation is not simply a matter of 'counting heads', representation of response would be considered when drawing conclusions.

A review of the ORS report indicates that the consultation appears to have been thorough. Whilst it did not collect data on all protected characteristics it did not appear to actively exclude any. Data on equalities is clearly presented and responses appear to be presented neutrally.

## Monitoring and Research:

## External View

Independent consultants were commissioned by the nine Dorset councils to carry out a set of assessments of the four options being considered to help inform Dorset councillors in their decision-making

- Dorset Councils Local Partnerships - Independent Financial Analysis: published $24^{\text {th }}$ August 2016
- Opinion Research Services - Consultation Report: published on $5^{\text {th }}$ December 2016
- PricewaterhouseCoopers - Case for Change (Appraisal of options): published on $5^{\text {th }}$ December 2016

To further inform the Dorset councillors, the EINA team have put together Appendix 3 - Census data factsheet on the options for reshaping your councils to provide base data on the demographic profiles of the four options. This data is summarised in Appendix 1 Demographic Profiles by Option.

Both documents will form the foundation of future EINAs.
The Census Factsheet shows the demographic distribution of the following indicators across the four options:

- Age profile
- Household type
- Ethnicity
- Religion
- Health/ Disability
- Economic Activity
- Education levels
- Profession levels

If a decision is made to create two new unitary councils in Dorset EINAs will be undertaken where necessary to identify the impact of the changes on: service users; residents; and those with protected characteristics. This will enable consideration to be given to ways of removing or mitigating the negative impacts.

None of the information presented by the external consultants or from the work undertaken by the equalities group present any issues which would be considered unlawful from an equalities perspective.

## Internal View

Human Resources teams in all councils will hold data about their staff. This data will need to be pooled should the new organisations be created and will be needed to identify the potential impact on any particular staff groups. Completion of full EINAs will help management document and highlight the impacts of any proposed changes and help in formulating final proposals which seek outcomes that avoid, minimise or mitigate the impacts identified.

## Assessing the Impact

The main driver for consideration of unitary councils across Dorset is the continuing significant reductions in available funding to deliver frontline services. It is anticipated that the introduction of unitary councils will reduce costs and improve efficiencies, particularly in respect of back office services, to help protect the continued delivery of frontline services. It is also anticipated that the creation of unitary councils will provide opportunities to innovate in the future delivery of services.

Until any new councils are defined it is impossible to assess the impact of change as it is not known which services will be affected and when and how they will change. However, it is possible to identify some potential, high level, general impacts on groups with protected characteristics and a table of these, analysed by protective characteristic, is attached as Appendix 2. This has not identified any potential issues that could be unlawful from an equalities perspective.

PWC's Case for Change report and Opinion Research Services' (ORS) consultation report do not present any issues which would be considered unlawful from an equalities perspective.

## Next steps

If new councils are formed, as new policies and changes in service delivery are considered, further detailed EINAs are required to be undertaken to identify the potential impacts on those with protected characteristics and seek to mitigate any issues, if possible. In due course when more detail about proposed changes is known it will also be possible to assess the cumulative impact where people fall into more than one protected characteristic - age, disability, etc.

Appendix 1 - Demographic Profiles by Option

| Protective characteristic | 2a |  | 2b |  | 2c |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Large Conurbation | Small Dorset | Medium Conurbation | Medium Dorset | Small Conurbation | Large Rural |
| Age <br> (ONS ${ }^{4}$ MidYear Estimate 2015) | Distribution of the 185,580 residents aged 65+ (24\% in total) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 65+110,646(23 \%) \\ & 85+18,175(4 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 65+74,927(26 \%) \\ & 85+10,569(3 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 65+83,411(21 \%) \\ & 85+13,916(4 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 65+102,162(27 \%) \\ & 85+14,828(4 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 65+68,003(20 \%) \\ & 85+11,342(3 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 65+117,570(28 \%) \\ & 85+17,402(4 \%) \end{aligned}$ |
| Dept. of Work and Pensions Nov. 2015 DLA ${ }^{5}$ and $A A^{6}$ | Distribution of the 52,220 people with disabilities and \% of population (7\% in total) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 31,380 (6\%) | 20,840 (7\%) | 25,640 (7\%) | 26,580 (7\%) | 21,600 (6\%) | 30,620 (7\%) |
|  | No major differences across the options |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gender <br> (ONS Mid-Year Estimate 2015) | Slightly higher proportion of females for Large Conurbation than any of the other options for the conurbation | All Dorset gender proportions are very similar. | Similar proportion of females for medium and small conurbations | All Dorset gender proportions are very similar. | Similar proportion of females for medium and small conurbations | All Dorset gender proportions are very similar. |
| Gender reassignment | No data |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pregnancy and Maternity | No data |  |  |  |  |  |

[^2]| Protective characteristic | 2a |  | 2b |  | 2c |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Large Conurbation | Small Dorset | Medium Conurbation | Medium Dorset | Small Conurbation | Large Rural |
| Marriage and Civil Partnership | No data |  |  |  |  |  |
| Race(BME $^{7}$ )ONS Census2011 | Distribution of the 60,241 BME population (8\% in total) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 47,314 (10.2\%) | 12,927 (4.7\%) | 44,024 (11.6\%) | 16,217 (4.4\%) | 41,686 (12.6\%) | 18,555 (4.5\%) |
| Religion or Belief ONS Census 2011 | Distribution of the 495,395 residents who express a religious faith (65\%) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 297,998 (63.9\%) | 183,565 (66.1\%) | 238,617 (63\%) | 242,946 (66.6\%) | 205,841 (62.2\%) | 275,722 (67.8\%) |
| Sexual Orientation | Main data missing, limited information, see fact sheet. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deprivation Dept of Work and Pensions Mar 2013, CTB $^{8}$ | Distribution of the 124,495 people on benefit (17\% in total) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 80,857 (17\%) | 43,638 (16\%) | 70,957 (18\%) | 53,538 (15\%) | 63,177 (19\%) | 61,318 (15\%) |
|  | Distribution of the 575,089 urban population and the 168,952 rural population (23\% in total) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rurality } \\ & \text { ONS Census } \\ & 2011 \end{aligned}$ | Urban Pop 443,843 (95\%) <br> Rural Pop 22,211 (5\%) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Urban Pop } \\ \text { 131,246 (47\%) } \\ \text { Rural Pop } \\ 146,741 \text { (53\%) } \end{gathered}$ | Urban Pop 377,844 (100\%) <br> Rural Pop <br> 1,044 (0\%) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Urban Pop } \\ \text { 197,245 (54\%) } \\ \text { Rural Pop } \\ \text { 167,908 (46\%) } \end{gathered}$ | Urban Population 330,761 (100\%) <br> Rural Population 375 (0\%) | Urban Population 244,328 (59\%) <br> Rural Population 168,577 (41\%) |

Appendix 2 A high level assessment of the potential impact

[^3]| Protected <br> characteristic | Context | Actual or potential positive benefit | Actual or potential negative <br> benefit |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Creating new unitary <br> organisations changes the <br> geographical boundaries for the <br> delivery of future services in <br> Dorset. | Changes the profile of service users <br> which may facilitate a greater focus <br> and support for those with protected <br> characteristics if their numbers are <br> greater. | Changes the profile of service users, <br> which may have implications for the <br> sustainability of the services to those <br> with protected characteristics, <br> particularly if their numbers are <br> significantly reduced, risking <br> marginalisation. |
|  |  | Reducing the cost of back office and <br> support services to protect frontline <br> services. | Easier for community and focus <br> groups to engage with the new, <br> fewer, larger councils. |
| characteristics |  |  |  |


| Protected characteristic | Context | Actual or potential positive benefit | Actual or potential negative benefit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age |  | within the community and employed by the organisations. |  |
|  | All "Dorset" options bring together upper and lower tier services. | This should lead to more joined up service provision across the range of local authority services provided to customers with protected characteristics, which may improve the service to these customers. |  |
|  |  | People with protected characteristics may be able to access services easier as there will be one point of contact, not two councils providing different services. |  |
|  | Conurbation options 2a and 2b bring together upper and lower tier services in the former lower tier areas. | This should lead to more joined up service provision across the range of local authority services provided to customers with protected characteristics in the former lower tier areas. |  |
|  | Options 2a, 2b and 2c change the distribution of the elderly ( $29 \%$ of population) between the potential new unitary councils. |  | The conurbation varies between 79,000 and 129,000, whilst "Dorset" is between 85,000 and 135,000 . Increased numbers could impact on the ability of new organisations to deliver effective services to older people. Services would include: social care, benefits, transport etc. |
|  | Further investment in digitisation of services. | Being able to access services from home may make access to services easier for people aged 65+ who have difficulty getting to council offices. | People aged 65+ may struggle to engage with digital services making it harder to access services, especially if there are less council offices/hubs. |


| Protected characteristic | Context | Actual or potential positive benefit | Actual or potential negative benefit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Rationalisation of assets leading to fewer buildings and reduced access to services through council offices/hubs. |  | People aged 65+ may struggle to access services if council offices/hubs are reduced in number e.g. increased travel time and lack of public transport in rural areas. |
|  | Rationalisation of staffing. |  | Reductions in senior staff may impact older staff disproportionately. |
| Disability | Options 2a, 2b and 2c change the distribution of the $7 \%$ disabled population between the potential new unitary councils. |  | The conurbation varies between 22,000 and 31,000 , and "Dorset" is between 21,000 and 31,000 . This increase in the number could impact on the ability of the new organisations to deliver effective services to disabled people. These services would include: social care, benefits, transport etc. |
|  | Further investment in digitisation of services. | Being able to access services from home may make access to services easier for people with disabilities who have difficulty getting to council offices. | People with disabilities may struggle to engage with digital services making it harder for them to access services, especially if council offices/hubs are reduced in number. |
|  | Rationalisation of assets leading to fewer buildings and reduced access to services through council offices/hubs. |  | People with disabilities may struggle to access services if there are less council offices/hubs. |
| Gender | For the community, at this stage of the proposals, it is not possible to identify any potential positive or negative impacts to this specific protected characteristic. |  |  |
|  | Rationalisation of staffing. |  | Reductions in staff could |


| Protected characteristic | Context | Actual or potential positive benefit | Actual or potential negative benefit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | disproportionately impact females. |
|  | Rationalisation of assets leading to fewer buildings. | A change in centre of duty may reduce travelling time for some staff, helping carers, who tend to be female. | A change in centre of duty may disproportionately affect female staff who tend to be carers and have family commitments. |
|  |  | Increase flexible working may lead to more home working which may help female members of staff who tend to be carers. |  |
| Gender reassignment | At this stage of the proposals, it is not possible to identify any potential positive or negative impacts to this specific protected characteristic within the community. |  |  |
| Pregnancy and maternity | At this stage of the proposals, it is not possible to identify any potential positive or negative impacts to this specific protected characteristic within the community. |  |  |
|  | Rationalisation of assets leading to fewer buildings. | Increase flexible working may lead to more home working which may help female members of staff stay in work after having children. |  |
| Marriage and civil partnerships | At this stage of the proposals, it is not possible to identify any potential positive or negative impacts to this specific protected characteristic within the community. |  |  |


| Protected characteristic | Context | Actual or potential positive benefit | Actual or potential negative benefit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Race | Majority of the 60,241 (69\%) of BME people live in Bournemouth and Poole. | Bringing these areas together would allow for a greater focus on BME groups. Options 2a, 2b and 2c support this. | Bringing these areas together may leave BME population more marginalised. Affected by options 2a, 2 b and 2 c . |
| Religion or belief | 496,000 people expressed a religious faith and represent $65 \%$ of the population of Dorset. Under options 2 a , $2 b$ and 2 c this group is sufficiently large that its distribution is between $62 \%$ and $68 \%$ of the new unitary populations and so there is unlikely to be any significant impact on this group as a whole. Further analysis would be required for the sub groups. |  |  |
| Sexual orientation | The majority of same sex marriages and civil partnerships are in Bournemouth and Poole. | Bringing these areas together would allow greater support for these people. Options 2a, 2b and 2c support this. |  |
| Deprivation | Options 2a, 2b and 2c change the distribution of the 124,000 (17\%) people on council tax benefit between the potential new unitary councils. |  | The conurbation varies between 63,000 and 81,000, whilst for "Dorset" is between 44,000 and 61,000 . This could impact on the ability of the new organisations to deliver effective services to help poorer families and members of the community. |
|  | Further investment in digitisation of services. | Being able to access services from home may make access to services easier for people on benefit who may have difficulty meeting the cost of getting to council offices. | People on benefit may struggle to engage with digital services making it harder to make claims and access services, especially if council offices/hubs are reduced in number. |
|  | Rationalisation of assets leading to fewer buildings and reduced access to services through council offices/hubs. |  | People on benefit may struggle to access services if there are less council offices/hubs, making them less accessible and more costly to get to. |


| Protected characteristic | Context | Actual or potential positive benefit | Actual or potential negative benefit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rurality | Options 2a, 2b and 2c change the distribution of the 169,000 (23\%) rural population between the potential new unitary councils. | For "Dorset" this varies between $147,000(53 \%)$ of the population and $169,000(41 \%)$ of the population. At around half of the total population in all options, means that there can be more focus on rural community issues. | For the conurbation this varies between 375 and 22,000. Option 2b only increases the rural population from 375 to 1,044 , so will have a minimal effect, although rural interests are likely to be marginalised. Option $2 a$ could result in greater isolation of a larger proportion of the rural communities in the lower tier areas included within the conurbation. |
|  | Further investment in digitisation of services. | Being able to access services from home may make access to services easier for people in rural communities who have difficulty getting to council offices, particularly with the lack of public transport. | People in rural communities may struggle to engage with digital services making it harder for them to access services, especially if council offices/hubs are reduced in number. |
|  | Rationalisation of assets leading to fewer buildings and reduced access to services through council offices/hubs. |  | People in rural communities may find it even harder, or more expensive, to access services if council offices/hubs are reduced in number. |

Census data factsheet on the options for reshaping your councils



|  | Bournemouth \& Poole |  | Bournemouth, Poole \& Christchurch |  | Bournemouth, Poole, Christchurch \& East Dorset |  | Dorset excluding Bournemouth \& Poole |  | Dorset excluding Bournemouth, Poole \& Christchurch |  | Dorset excluding Bournemouth, Poole, Christchurch \& East Dorset |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| Lives in a household | 160,599 | 163,642 | 183,311 | 188,228 | 224,986 | 232,746 | 195,916 | 207,450 | 173,204 | 182,864 | 131,529 | 138,346 |
| Percentage living in a household | 98.2\% | 97.6\% | 98.4\% | 97.8\% | 98.5\% | 97.9\% | 97.3\% | 98.0\% | 97.1\% | 97.9\% | 96.4\% | 97.7\% |
| Age 0 to 4 | 9,582 | 9,116 | 10,685 | 10,152 | 12,614 | 11,953 | 9,842 | 9,460 | 8,739 | 8,424 | 6,810 | 6,623 |
| Age 5 to 9 | 7,906 | 7,528 | 9,071 | 8,577 | 11,163 | 10,570 | 10,264 | 9,507 | 9,099 | 8,458 | 7,007 | 6,465 |
| Age 10 to 14 | 8,215 | 7,962 | 9,590 | 9,137 | 12,032 | 11,376 | 11,323 | 10,774 | 9,948 | 9,599 | 7,506 | 7,360 |
| Age 15 to 19 | 9,292 | 9,280 | 10,574 | 10,487 | 12,966 | 12,829 | 11,295 | 10,668 | 10,013 | 9,461 | 7,621 | 7,119 |
| Age 20 to 24 | 12,254 | 12,155 | 13,352 | 13,109 | 15,320 | 14,744 | 9,850 | 8,600 | 8,752 | 7,646 | 6,784 | 6,011 |
| Age 25 to 29 | 11,644 | 11,689 | 12,550 | 12,660 | 14,030 | 14,170 | 8,102 | 8,490 | 7,196 | 7,519 | 5,716 | 6,009 |
| Age 30 to 34 | 11,920 | 11,029 | 12,923 | 12,039 | 14,466 | 13,669 | 8,703 | 8,749 | 7,700 | 7,739 | 6,157 | 6,109 |
| Age 35 to 39 | 11,230 | 10,339 | 12,393 | 11,564 | 14,405 | 13,773 | 10,390 | 10,936 | 9,227 | 9,711 | 7,215 | 7,502 |
| Age 40 to 44 | 11,859 | 11,028 | 13,312 | 12,635 | 16,031 | 15,603 | 13,176 | 14,018 | 11,723 | 12,411 | 9,004 | 9,443 |
| Age 45 to 49 | 11,784 | 11,430 | 13,430 | 13,063 | 16,547 | 16,409 | 14,745 | 15,288 | 13,099 | 13,655 | 9,982 | 10,309 |
| Age 50 to 54 | 9,774 | 9,916 | 11,174 | 11,439 | 14,109 | 14,573 | 13,554 | 14,583 | 12,154 | 13,060 | 9,219 | 9,926 |
| Age 55 to 59 | 8,807 | 9,125 | 10,110 | 10,594 | 12,887 | 13,601 | 12,987 | 14,032 | 11,684 | 12,563 | 8,907 | 9,556 |
| Age 60 to 64 | 9,784 | 10,107 | 11,493 | 12,110 | 14,949 | 15,999 | 15,715 | 17,350 | 14,006 | 15,347 | 10,550 | 11,458 |
| Age 65 to 69 | 7,828 | 8,090 | 9,473 | 9,951 | 12,474 | 13,230 | 13,749 | 14,804 | 12,104 | 12,943 | 9,103 | 9,664 |
| Age 70 to 74 | 6,252 | 6,762 | 7,634 | 8,394 | 10,227 | 11,285 | 11,067 | 12,116 | 9,685 | 10,484 | 7,092 | 7,593 |
| Age 75 to 79 | 5,162 | 6,509 | 6,441 | 8,001 | 8,672 | 10,534 | 9,171 | 10,670 | 7,892 | 9,178 | 5,661 | 6,645 |
| Age 80 to 84 | 4,014 | 5,676 | 4,954 | 7,027 | 6,616 | 9,099 | 6,751 | 8,707 | 5,811 | 7,356 | 4,149 | 5,284 |
| Age 85 and over | 3,292 | 5,901 | 4,152 | 7,289 | 5,478 | 9,329 | 5,232 | 8,698 | 4,372 | 7,310 | 3,046 | 5,270 |
|  | Bournemouth \& Poole |  | Bournemouth, Poole \& Christchurch |  | Bournemouth, Poole, Christchurch \& East Dorset |  | Dorset excluding Bournemouth \& Poole |  | Dorset excluding Bournemouth, Poole \& Christchurch |  | Dorset excluding Bournemouth, Poole, Christchurch \& East Dorset |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| Lives in a communal establishment | 2,908 | 3,987 | 3,070 | 4,279 | 3,385 | 4,937 | 5,355 | 4,184 | 5,193 | 3,892 | 4,878 | 3,234 |
| Age 0 to 4 | 11 | 16 | 14 | 17 | 17 | 21 | 19 | 12 | 16 | 11 | 13 | 7 |
| Age 5 to 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 30 | 42 | 30 | 42 | 26 | 39 |
| Age 10 to 14 | 77 | 69 | 88 | 70 | 100 | 79 | 505 | 421 | 494 | 420 | 482 | 411 |
| Age 15 to 19 | 713 | 725 | 727 | 734 | 767 | 761 | 1,451 | 708 | 1,437 | 699 | 1,397 | 672 |
| Age 20 to 24 | 462 | 439 | 469 | 443 | 486 | 455 | 854 | 146 | 847 | 142 | 830 | 130 |
| Age 25 to 29 | 202 | 112 | 206 | 113 | 218 | 124 | 428 | 71 | 424 | 70 | 412 | 59 |
| Age 30 to 34 | 121 | 74 | 122 | 76 | 136 | 90 | 318 | 64 | 317 | 62 | 303 | 48 |
| Age 35 to 39 | 106 | 48 | 109 | 49 | 123 | 63 | 258 | 65 | 255 | 64 | 241 | 50 |
| Age 40 to 44 | 112 | 59 | 116 | 61 | 127 | 68 | 200 | 47 | 196 | 45 | 185 | 38 |
| Age 45 to 49 | 85 | 63 | 89 | 64 | 100 | 71 | 174 | 55 | 170 | 54 | 159 | 47 |
| Age 50 to 54 | 107 | 50 | 110 | 59 | 113 | 70 | 131 | 61 | 128 | 52 | 125 | 41 |
| Age 55 to 59 | 76 | 48 | 77 | 50 | 79 | 60 | 88 | 72 | 87 | 70 | 85 | 60 |
| Age 60 to 64 | 62 | 65 | 68 | 68 | 73 | 73 | 91 | 48 | 85 | 45 | 80 | 40 |
| Age 65 to 69 | 70 | 71 | 74 | 75 | 82 | 87 | 55 | 59 | 51 | 55 | 43 | 43 |
| Age 70 to 74 | 66 | 85 | 74 | 92 | 84 | 107 | 76 | 64 | 68 | 57 | 58 | 42 |
| Age 75 to 79 | 101 | 185 | 110 | 207 | 129 | 235 | 113 | 160 | 104 | 138 | 85 | 110 |
| Age 80 to 84 | 158 | 375 | 178 | 412 | 216 | 506 | 155 | 365 | 135 | 328 | 97 | 234 |
| Age 85 and over | 374 | 1,498 | 434 | 1,684 | 526 | 2,059 | 409 | 1,724 | 349 | 1,538 | 257 | 1,163 |



|  | Bournemouth \& Poole |  | Bournemouth, Poole \& Christchurch |  | Bournemouth, Poole, Christchurch \& East Dorset |  | Dorset excluding Bournemouth \& Poole |  | Dorset excluding Bournemouth, Poole \& Christchurch |  | Dorset excluding Bournemouth, Poole, Christchurch \& East Dorset |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ethnicity | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| All usual residents | 163,507 | 167,629 | 186,381 | 192,507 | 228,371 | 237,683 | 201,271 | 211,634 | 178,397 | 186,756 | 136,407 | 141,580 |
| White | 152,687 | 157,633 | 175,025 | 181,886 | 216,267 | 226,289 | 196,859 | 207,458 | 174,521 | 183,205 | 133,279 | 138,802 |
| White: English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern lrish/8ritish | 143,071 | 146,379 | 164,908 | 169,956 | 205,422 | 213,318 | 192,435 | 201,915 | 170,598 | 178,338 | 130,084 | 134,976 |
| White: Irish | 979 | 1,132 | 1,112 | 1,298 | 1,258 | 1,523 | 896 | 1,079 | 763 | 913 | 617 | 688 |
| White: Gypsy or lrish Traveller | 228 | 204 | 248 | 232 | 337 | 314 | 299 | 256 | 279 | 228 | 190 | 146 |
| White: Other White | 8,409 | 9,918 | 8,757 | 10,400 | 9,250 | 11,134 | 3,229 | 4,208 | 2,881 | 3,726 | 2,388 | 2,992 |
| Mixed/multiple ethnic groups | 3,114 | 2,993 | 3,370 | 3,242 | 3,669 | 3,537 | 1,764 | 1,636 | 1,508 | 1,387 | 1,209 | 1,092 |
| Mixed/multiple ethnic groups: White and Black Caribbean | 758 | 776 | 822 | 822 | 916 | 891 | 546 | 406 | 482 | 360 | 388 | 291 |
| Mixed/multiple ethnic groups: White and Black Arrican | 441 | 406 | 473 | 443 | 502 | 481 | 210 | 221 | 178 | 184 | 149 | 146 |
| Mixed/multiple ethnic groups: White and Asian | 1,118 | 958 | 1,218 | 1,053 | 1,321 | 1,179 | 612 | 600 | 512 | 505 | 409 | 379 |
| Mixed/multiple ethnic groups: Other Mixed | 797 | 853 | 857 | 924 | 930 | 986 | 396 | 409 | 336 | 338 | 263 | 276 |
| Asian/Asian British | 5,159 | 5,183 | 5,357 | 5,480 | 5,709 | 5,865 | 1,819 | 2,014 | 1,621 | 1,717 | 1,269 | 1,332 |
| Asian/Asian British: Indian | 1,667 | 1,371 | 1,714 | 1,421 | 1,797 | 1,495 | 388 | 349 | 341 | 299 | 258 | 225 |
| Asian/Asian British: Pakistani | 186 | 123 | 189 | 125 | 213 | 144 | 88 | 63 | 85 | 61 | 61 | 42 |
| Asian/Asian British: Bangladeshi | 434 | 356 | 452 | 382 | 578 | 454 | 311 | 214 | 293 | 188 | 167 | 116 |
| Asian/Asian British: Chinese | 1,150 | 1,388 | 1,227 | 1,490 | 1,290 | 1,594 | 407 | 536 | 330 | 434 | 267 | 330 |
| Asian/Asian British: Other Asian | 1,722 | 1,945 | 1,775 | 2,062 | 1,831 | 2,178 | 625 | 852 | 572 | 735 | 516 | 619 |
| Black/African/Caribbean/Black British | 1,283 | 1,001 | 1,325 | 1,042 | 1,373 | 1,100 | 589 | 335 | 547 | 294 | 499 | 236 |
| Black/African/Caribbean/Black British: African | 835 | 702 | 855 | 732 | 880 | 768 | 310 | 208 | 290 | 178 | 265 | 142 |
| Black/African/Caribbean/Black British: Caribbean | 305 | 194 | 324 | 202 | 342 | 213 | 214 | 81 | 195 | 73 | 177 | 62 |
| Black/African/Caribbean/Black British: Other Black | 143 | 105 | 146 | 108 | 151 | 119 | 65 | 46 | 62 | 43 | 57 | 32 |
| Other ethnic group | 1,264 | 819 | 1,304 | 857 | 1,353 | 892 | 240 | 191 | 200 | 153 | 151 | 118 |
| Other ethnic group: Arab | 557 | 263 | 571 | 264 | 590 | 271 | 81 | 35 | 67 | 34 | 48 | 27 |
| Other ethnic group: Any other ethnic group | 707 | 556 | 733 | 593 | 763 | 621 | 159 | 156 | 133 | 119 | 103 | 91 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ite British |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dorset excluding Bournemouth \& Poole |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bournemouth, Poole, Christchurch, East Dorset |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bournemouth, Poole \& Christchurch |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bournemouth, Poole | stchurch |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ian/Asian |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bourmemouth \& Poole $\quad$ - Black/Arrican/Caribean/Black British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0\% | 10\% | 20\% | 4 | 50\% | \% | 80\% | 90\% | 100\% Ot | her ethnic 9 |  |  |






|  | Bournemouth \& Poole |  | Bournemouth, Poole \& Christchurch |  | Bournemouth, Poole, Christchurch \& East Dorset |  | Dorset excluding Bournemouth \& Poole |  | Dorset excluding Bournemouth, Poole \& Christchurch |  | Dorset excluding Bournemouth, Poole, Christchurch \& East Dorset |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Economic Activity | Persons | \% | Persons | \% | Persons | \% | Persons | \% | Persons | \% | Persons | \% |
| All usual residents aged 16 to 74 | 243,965 |  | 276,610 |  | 337,657 |  | 293,441 |  | 260,796 |  | 199,749 |  |
| Economically active | 171,737 | 70.4\% | 193,157 | 69.8\% | 234,733 | 69.5\% | 199,943 | 68.1\% | 178,523 | 68.5\% | 136,947 | 68.6\% |
| In employment | 152,547 | 62.5\% | 172,178 | 62.2\% | 210,781 | 62.4\% | 184,949 | 63.0\% | 165,318 | 63.4\% | 126,715 | 63.4\% |
| Employee: Part-ime | 34,504 | 14.1\% | 39,606 | 14.3\% | 49,267 | 14.6\% | 46,265 | 15.8\% | 41,163 | 15.8\% | 31,502 | 15.8\% |
| Employee: Full-time | 93,189 | 38.2\% | 103,975 | 37.6\% | 125,272 | 37.1\% | 101,952 | 34.7\% | 91,166 | 35.0\% | 69,869 | 35.0\% |
| Self-employed | 24,854 | 10.2\% | 28,597 | 10.3\% | 36,242 | 10.7\% | 36,732 | 12.5\% | 32,989 | 12.6\% | 25,344 | 12.7\% |
| Unemployed | 8,675 | 3.6\% | 9,682 | 3.5\% | 10,991 | 3.3\% | 7,986 | 2.7\% | 6,979 | 2.7\% | 5,670 | 2.8\% |
| Full-time student | 10,515 | 4.3\% | 11,297 | 4.1\% | 12,961 | 3.8\% | 7,008 | 2.4\% | 6,226 | 2.4\% | 4,562 | 2.3\% |
| Economically Inactive | 72,228 | 29.6\% | 83,453 | 30.2\% | 102,924 | 30.5\% | 93,498 | 31.9\% | 82,273 | 31.5\% | 62,802 | 31.4\% |
| Retired | 34,015 | 13.9\% | 41,505 | 15.0\% | 55,000 | 16.3\% | 59,463 | 20.3\% | 51,973 | 19.9\% | 38,478 | 19.3\% |
| Student (including full-time students) | 15,106 | 6.2\% | 16,173 | 5.8\% | 17,790 | 5.3\% | 9,336 | 3.2\% | 8,269 | 3.2\% | 6,652 | 3.3\% |
| Looking after home or family | 9,225 | 3.8\% | 10,384 | 3.8\% | 12,623 | 3.7\% | 10,556 | 3.6\% | 9,397 | 3.6\% | 7,158 | 3.6\% |
| Long-term sick or disabled | 9,662 | 4.0\% | 10,716 | 3.9\% | 12,070 | 3.6\% | 9,080 | 3.1\% | 8,026 | 3.1\% | 6,672 | 3.3\% |
| Other | 4,220 | 1.7\% | 4,675 | 1.7\% | 5,441 | 1.6\% | 5,063 | 1.7\% | 4,608 | 1.8\% | 3,842 | 1.9\% |



|  | Bournemouth | Poole | Bournemouth | ole \& | Bournemo | ole, Dorset | Dorset excludi Bournemouth |  | Dorset excludi Bournemouth, Christchurch | oole \& | Dorset excludi Bournemouth, Christchurch $\&$ Dorset | oole, <br> ast |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All usual residents aged $16+$ | Persons 277,210 | \% | Persons 317,499 | \% | Persons 391,056 | \% | Persons 345,596 | \% | Persons 305,307 | \% | Persons $231,750$ | \% |
| In a registered same-sex civil partnership | 963 | 0.3\% | 1,049 | 0.3\% | 1,171 | 0.3\% | 640 | 0.2\% | 554 | 0.2\% | 432 | 0.2\% |
| Benefit claimants - Employment and Support Allowance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Persons | \% | Persons | \% | Persons | \% | Persons | \% | Persons | \% | Persons | \% |
| Total population age 16-64 (Mid-Year Estimate 2015) | 219,400 |  | 245,300 |  | 293,300 |  | 235,800 |  | 209,800 |  | 161,900 |  |
| Total | 12,990 | 5.9\% | 14,320 | 5.8\% | 15,960 | 5.4\% | 11,590 | 4.9\% | 10,260 | 4.9\% | 8,620 | 5.3\% |
| White | 9,560 | 73.6\% | 10,520 | 73.5\% | 11,610 | 72.7\% | 8,330 | 71.9\% | 7,370 | 71.8\% | 6,270 | 72.7\% |
| White : British | 9,180 | 70.7\% | 10,120 | 70.7\% | 11,190 | 70.1\% | 8,150 | 70.3\% | 7,210 | 70.3\% | 6,140 | 71.2\% |
| White : Irish | 70 | 0.5\% | 80 | 0.6\% | 80 | 0.5\% | 50 | 0.4\% | 40 | 0.4\% | 40 | 0.5\% |
| White : Other white | 310 | 2.4\% | 320 | 2.2\% | 340 | 2.1\% | 130 | 1.1\% | 120 | 1.2\% | 90 | 1.0\% |
| Ethnic minority | 400 | 3.1\% | 410 | 2.9\% | 420 | 2.6\% | 100 | 0.9\% | 90 | 0.9\% | 70 | 0.8\% |
| Prefer not to say or unknown | 3,030 | 23.3\% | 3,400 | 23.7\% | 3,920 | 24.6\% | 3,170 | 27.4\% | 2,800 | 27.3\% | 2,280 | 26.5\% |
| Source: DWP, February 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disability related benefits, November 2015** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Persons | \% | Persons | \% | Persons | \% | Persons | \% | Persons | \% | Persons | \% |
| Population (MYE 2015) | 345,100 |  | 394,160 |  | 482,850 |  | 420,590 |  | 371,530 |  | 282,840 |  |
| Attendance Allowance | 8,500 |  | 10,540 |  | 13,680 |  | 14,320 |  | 12,280 |  | 9,140 |  |
| Disability Allowance | 13,100 |  | 15,100 |  | 17,700 |  | 16,300 |  | 14,300 |  | 11,700 |  |
| Disability based benefit | 21,600 | 6\% | 25,640 | 7\% | 31,380 | 6\% | 30,620 | 7\% | 26,580 | 7\% | 20,840 | 7\% |
| Rurality (2011 Census) | Persons | \% | Persons | \% | Persons | \% | Persons | \% | Persons | \% | Persons | \% |
| Population | 331,136 |  | 378,888 |  | 466,054 |  | 412,905 |  | 365,153 |  | 277,987 |  |
| Urban Population | 330,761 | 100\% | 377,844 | 100\% | 443,843 | 95\% | 244,328 | 59\% | 197,245 | 54\% | 131,246 | 47\% |
| Rural Population | 375 | 0\% | 1,044 | 0\% | 22,211 | 5\% | 168,577 | 41\% | 167,908 | 46\% | 146,741 | 53\% |
| Benefit Population - Claimants of Council Tax Benefit, their partners and dependents as of March 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Persons | \% | Persons | \% | Persons | \% | Persons | \% | Persons | \% | Persons | \% |
| Total Population (MYE 2013) | 337,742 |  | 386,110 |  | 474,009 |  | 416,721 |  | 368,353 |  | 280,454 |  |
| Benefit Population (Source: DWP March 2013) | 63,177 | 19\% | 70,957 | 18\% | 80,857 | 17\% | 61,318 | 15\% | 53,538 | 15\% | 43,638 | 16\% |

## Explanatory Notes

Population totals may differ due to different population base (check age groups included)

Communal Establishment residents excludes staff and their families.
A dependent child is any person aged 0 to 15 in a household (whether or not in a family) or a person aged 16 to 18 in full-time education and living in a family with his or her parent(s) or grandparent(s). It does not include any people aged 16 to 18 who have a spouse, partner or child ving in the household.
Social Grade is the socio-economic classification used by the Market Research and Marketing Industries, most often in the analys is of spending habits and consumer attitudes. Although it is not possible to allocate Social Grade precisely from information collected by the 2011 Census, the habits and consumer attitudes. Although it is not possible to allocate Social Grade precisely from information collected by the 2011 .
Each individual aged 16 or over is assigned the approximated social grade of their Household Reference Person, according to standard market research practice.
The age range for this table has been restricted to 16 to 64 . The approximated social grade algorithm used in the census produces results for this age range that are consistent with those from other data sources. The information collected in the census produces less accurate results for those outside of this age range and therefore will not be made available.

No Qualifications: No academic or professional qualifications

- Level 1 qualifications: 1-4 O Levels/CSE/GCSEs (any grades), Entry Level, Foundation Diploma, NVQ level 1, Foundation GNVQ,

Basic/Essential Skills

- Level 2 qualifications: $5+$ O Level (Passes)/CSEs (Grade 1)/GCSEs (Grades A*-C), School Certificate, 1 A Level/ 2-3 AS Levels/VCEs, Intermediate/Higher Diploma, Welsh Baccalaureate Intermediate Diploma, NVQ level 2, Intermediate GNVQ, City and Guilds Craft, BTEC First/General Dipl
Apprenticeship
pprenticeship
ications: $2+$ ALevels/VCEs, 4+ AS Levels, Higher School Certificate, Progression/Advanced Diploma, Welsh Baccal aureate㲘 iploma, BTEC Higher level, Foundation degree (NI), Professional qualifications (for example teaching, nursing, accountancy)
- Other qualifications: Vocational/Work-related Qualifications, Foreign Qualifications (Not stated/ level unknown).

HRP Household Representative Person

* Department of Work \& Pensions February 2016 (Based on 5\% Sample)

The final three sections are supplied by DCC. These look at:
Disability - The data set measures the number of people that were claiming attendance allowance and disability living allowance as of February 2016. This data set is a $5 \%$ sample set but gives a good indication of those who are considered to be suffering from a disabilty under the age of 65 (Disability Living Allowance) and those aged $65+$ who have disability (Attendance Allowance)
Rurality - This is based on data from the ONS Census 2011 and considers the population that live in areas deemed to be either urban or rural based on the density of population and spatial distribution. Deprivation - The data set from the Department of Work and Pensions considers deprivation and this data set looks at those in receipt of
council tax benefit in March 2013 as a proxy for low income. The data set considers the claimants, their partners and dependents and together

## Research \& Information <br> Development Service

St Stephen's Road
Bournemouth BH2 6EA

Tel (01202) 454684
$\xrightarrow[\text { Dorset }]{+4 \mathrm{C}}$
East Dorset
Dorset
Tharth Dorset
Weymouth \& Portland Borough Council
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[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ Office for National Statistics
    ${ }^{5}$ Disability Living Allowance
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    ${ }^{8}$ Council Tax Benefit

