Briefing Note
Findings for Cambridge for IMD Index 2015

Foreword

The Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) published the English Indices of Deprivation 2015 (ID 2015) on the 30 September 2015. The indices are combined into the composite Index of Multiple Deprivation 2015 (IMD 2015). Documents, including an Infographic, Guidance and the Main Findings can be found here: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2015

The IMD ranks each small area in England from:

1st most deprived area — 32,844th least deprived area

32,844 small areas (called Lower-layer Super Output Areas) in England with an average of 1,500 residents each

An IMD score for an area is taken from the average score for seven domains of deprivation, each with a different weighting. This briefing note will highlight the findings from IMD Index scores, including sub-index and the domains, looking more in depth at the highly ranked areas and their characteristics.

Contents

1. Research Group IMD Summary

Cambridgeshire Research Group has provided a Summary Report looking at IMD data for Cambridgeshire and comparing the differences in national and local ranks and deciles from IMD 2010 to IMD 2015. It can be found here:

http://www.cambridgeshireinsight.org.uk/deprivation-0

It highlights caveats in using the historical data that include:

- LSOA definitions have changed between the 2015 and 2010 releases. As such, some locations will not be comparable at all.
- The variables used to define each indices of deprivation have been updated with each publication. As such, changes in apparent deprivation may reflect these changes in methodology rather than actual changes in local circumstance.

2. Main Findings for IMD Cambridgeshire

- Compared to 2010, Fenland and East Cambridgeshire now rank as more deprived in national terms than previously - Cambridge City ranks as less deprived. The movement of South Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire is not significant.
- Cambridgeshire now has 16 LSOAs in the 20% most deprived nationally – this is compared to 9 in 2010. Two are in Cambridge City, two are in Huntingdonshire and 12 are in Fenland.
- Four of the LSOAs in Fenland are in the 10% most deprived nationally, all of which are in Wisbech.Eight of the top 10 most deprived LSOAs in Cambridgeshire are in Fenland. Two are in Cambridge City.
- 49% of LSOAs in Cambridgeshire have remained in the same national decile (group of 10%) from 2010 to 2015.Overall 56% (198) of LSOAs in Cambridgeshire have increased in national ranks (are measured as being relatively less deprived) since 2010. Within this, 28 LSOAs have increased (improved) by 4000 – 8000 positions, out of 32,844

Additionally the Research Group has included the statistical release in **Cambridgeshire Atlas**, an interactive mapping tool, which can be used across all of the domains. Some of these maps have been used in this briefing.
http://www.cambridgeshireinsight.org.uk/deprivation-0

The national indices of **deprivation explorer** also allows an investigation of IMD scores in more depth. It can be found here:
http://dclgapps.communities.gov.uk/imd/idmap.html

3. Summary of findings for Cambridge

- Overall Cambridge's Average IMD Rank has increased by 39 places since 2010, from 188 to 227 in 2015, with 1 being the most deprived.
- The ten most deprived LSOAs in Cambridge are in the North and North East of the City. Three of the ten have a lower national IMD 2015 ranking than in 210. The other seven have higher national IMD 2015 rankings than 2010. Please refer to Map 1 and Table 1.

**Map 1: Ten Lowest IMD 2015 Ranked LSOAs in Cambridge**

Table 1: Ten lowest IMD 2015 ranked LSOAs in Cambridge

Ward	LSOA code (2011)	City Rank 2015	City Rank 2010	Cambs Rank	IMD Rank 2015	IMD Rank 2010	Change in IMD Rank
Abbey	E01017948	1	3	9	5,578	6769	-1,191
Abbey	E01017946	2	4	10	5,861	6925	-1,064
Kings Hedges	E01017975	3	5	23	8,245	7111	1,134
Kings Hedges	E01017977	4	8	24	8,340	9208	-868
Arbury	E01017952	5	7	26	8,539	7977	562
Abbey	E01017944	6	10	65	8,888	9636	-748
East Chesterton	E01017971	7	6	33	9,078	7949	1,129
Kings Hedges	E01017978	8	2	34	9,123	6152	2,971
Kings Hedges	E01017979	9	1	37	9,579	5942	3,637
Arbury	E01017953	10	18	50	12,426	11556	870

3

4. Roads covered by ten lowest ranked LSOAs

The following maps show the roads covered by the ten lowest IMD 2015 ranked LSOAs in Cambridge, to help identify disadvantaged communities.

**Map 2: Arbury LSOAs in Cambridge 10 lowest IMD Scores**

Map 3: Kings Hedges LSOAs in Cambridge 10 lowest IMD Scores

Map 4: Arbury LSOAs in Cambridge 10 lowest IMD Scores

Map 5: East Chesterton LSOAs in Cambridge 10 lowest IMD Scores

5. Changes in IMD Rankings

- Out of Cambridge's 70 SLOAs, only 9 (13%) have seen a decrease in their national IMD ranking position – so are relatively more deprived than they were in 2010. The remaining 61 SLOAs (77%) have seen an increase in their national IMD ranking position. Please refer to Map 2 for the five SLOAs with highest and lowest changes in ranking and Tables 2.

Map 6: Five largest increases and decreases in LSOAs ranking in IMD2015

Table 2: Top five LSOAs showing changes in ranking

Ward	LSOA code (2011)	IMD Rank 2015	IMD Rank 2010	Negative Change
Newnham	E01017984	25,496	30447	-4,951
Castle	E01017956	25,735	27255	-1,520
Abbey	E01017943	19,496	20692	-1,196
Abbey	E01017948	5,578	6769	-1,191
Abbey	E01017946	5,861	6925	-1,064

Ward	LSOA code (2011)	IMD Rank 2015	IMD Rank 2010	Positive Change
Coleridge	E01017967	18,013	10246	7,767
Market	E01017983	26,205	19417	6,788
Petersfield	E01017989	23,129	16413	6,716
Petersfield	E01017987	24,222	18421	5,801
Cherry Hinton	E01017963	20,785	15078	5,707

6

6. IMD Deciles

It is common to describe how relatively deprived a small area is by saying whether it falls among the most deprived 10 per cent, 20 per cent or 30 per cent of small areas in England (although there is no definitive cut-off at which an area is described as 'deprived'). Chart 1, below, shows the proportion of LSOAs for each district falling within each decile.

Chart 1: Proportion of LSOAs in each decile by district

**Chart 2**, below, shows the proportion of the LSOAs that make-up each of the deciles in the "bubble" format.

- Fenland has just over two 40% of its population living in the 30% most deprived deciles and in contrast South Cambridgeshire has 40% of its population living in the least deprived 10% decile. The Cambridge spread of LSOAs across the deciles is more even than for the other districts, although the city has no LSOA's in the most deprived 10%.

- Nearly 40% of residents in the city live in the 8,9,10 least deprived deciles.

- Two LSOAs in Abbey ward appear in the 2nd decile (lowest 20% IMD score nationally) in IMD 2015. Previously two LSOAs in Kings Hedges were in the 2nd quintile (20% most deprived nationally). Please refer to Table 3 below.

Table 3: Decile position for ten lowest LSOAs in Cambridge

Ward	LSOA code (2011)	City Decile 2015	Cambs Decile 2015	National Decile 2015	National Quintile 2010
Abbey	E01017948	1		2	2
Abbey	E01017946	1		2	2
Kings Hedges	E01017975	1		3	2
Kings Hedges	E01017977	1		3	2
Arbury	E01017952	1		3	2
Abbey	E01017944	1		3	2
East Chesterton	E01017971	1		3	2
Kings Hedges	E01017978	1		3	1 (20% most deprived)
Kings Hedges	E01017979	1		3	1
Arbury	E01017953	2		4	2

7. Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index

The IDACI measures the proportion of all children aged 0 to 15 living in income deprived families. The definition of low income includes both those people that are out of work and those that are in work but who have low earnings.

Main findings for IDACI in Cambridge

- Cambridge's Rank of Average Scores for IDACI in 2015 was 201 out of the 326 district local authorities, with 1st being the most deprived. In comparison Fenland had a Rank of Average Score of 83 for IDACI 2015.
- Four of Cambridge's 70 SLOAs fall within the worst 20% of LSOAs in the country in the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index.
- 14 LSOAs (20%) saw a deterioration in their national ranking positions in the IDACI whilst 56 (80%) LSOAs improved their position, since 2010.
- The LSOA in Abbey with the lowest ranking position in the IDACI was close to its previous point in 2010. An LSOA in Arbury has moved into the lowest ranking ten LSOAs in Cambridge for the first time (E01017952).
- Six LSOAs, covering a part of Arbury and Kings Hedges ward form a cluster of lower ranking IDACI LSOAs.
- One LSOA in West Chesterton moved 6,863 places or just over 20% of national ranking places in the five years since IMD 2010.
- The lowest ranking LOSA had just over a third of children that were income deprived.
- One fifth of all LSOAs in Cambridge contain between 24% and 34% of children living in income deprived families.

Map 7: Ten Lowest IDACI LSOA Scores in Cambridge

9

Table 3: Ten lowest IDACI Ranked LSOAs in Cambridge

Ward	LSOA code (2011)	2015 IDACI Cambridge Rank	2010 IDACI Cambridge Rank	National decile (10%)	Proportion of children in LSOA income deprived
Abbey	E01017948	1	2	2	34%
Kings Hedges	E01017975	2	5	2	33%
East Chesterton	E01017971	3	3	2	31%
Kings Hedges	E01017978	4	1	2	31%
Arbury	E01017954	5		3	30%
East Chesterton	E01017974	6	4	3	27%
Kings Hedges	E01017979	7	8	3	26%
Arbury	E01017952	8	14	3	25%
East Chesterton	E01032802	9	-	3	25%
Arbury	E01017953	10	9	3	25%

Map 8: Five largest increases and decreases in IDACI rankings in IMD2015

Table 4: Top five IDACI LSOAs showing changes in rankings

Ward	LSOA code (2011)	2015 IDACI Rank	2010 IDACI Rank	Negative Change
West Chesterton	E01018010	25356	32219	-6863
Castle	E01017958	12906	17112	-4206
Abbey	E01017947	9606	13544	-3938
Coleridge	E01017969	18125	21448	-3323
Kings Hedges	E01017987	17976	24453	-2752

Ward	LSOA code (2011)	2015 IDACI Rank	2010 IDACI Rank	Positive Change
Market	E01017983	30773	21684	9089
Newnham	E01017985	30006	21680	8326
Petersfield	E01017989	23181	15818	7363
Arbury	E01017950	30405	23500	6905
Petersfield	E01017987	25285	18418	6867

8. Income Deprivation Affecting Older People Index (IDAOP)

The Income Deprivation Affecting Older People Index (IDAOP) measures the proportion of all those aged 60 and over who experience income deprivation.

Main findings for IDAOP in Cambridge

- Cambridge's Rank of Average Scores for IDAOP in 2015 was 182 out of the 326 district local authorities, with 1st being the most deprived. In comparison Fenland had a Rank of Average Score of 83 for IDAOP 2015.
- One of Cambridge's 70 LSOAs fell within the worst 20% of LSOAs in the country in the Income Deprivation Affecting Older People Index (IDAOP).
- 22 LSOAs (31%) had a lower national ranking position in the IDAOP for 2015 compared to 2010 whilst 48 (69%) had improved their position.
- The lowest ranked LSOA in Cambridge for IDAOP was 1,300 places lower than the next ranked LSOA and contained just under a third of income deprived older people.
- The lower ranked IDAOP LSOAs have a greater distribution across the City and aren't clustered in the North in the way that deprivation affecting children is.
- An LSOA in Romsey improved by 7,900 places in the national ranking for IDAOP between 2010 and 2015.
- One fifth of all LSOAs in Cambridge contain between 21% and 29% of older income deprived people over sixty years of age.

Map 9: Ten Lowest IDAOP LSOA Scores in Cambridge

Table 5: Ten lowest IDAOP Ranked LSOAs in Cambridge

Ward	LSOA code (2011)	2015 IDAOP Cambridge Rank	2010 IDAOP Cambridge Rank	National decile (10%)	Proportion of older people in LSOA income deprived
Kings Hedges	E01017978	1	4	2	29%
Abbey	E01017948	2	5	3	26%
Kings Hedges	E01017979	3	2	3	26%
Castle	E01017958	4	3	3	26%
Coleridge	E01017965	5	9	3	26%
Kings Hedges	E01017977	6	10	3	24%
Petersfield	E01017991	7	6	3	24%
East Chesterton	E01017974	8	11	3	24%
Cherry Hinton	E01017961	9	17	3	24%
East Chesterton	E01017971	10	8	3	23%

Map 10: Five largest increases and decreases in IDAOP rankings in IMD2015

Table 6: Top five LSOAs showing changes in rankings

Ward	LSOA code (2011)	2015 IDAOP Rank	2010 IDAOP Rank	Negative Change
West Chesterton	E01018006	19600	25348	-5748
Arbury	E01017949	11217	16089	-4872
Abbey	E01017944	10345	14345	-4000
Cherry Hinton	E01017961	9209	12555	-3346
Market	E01017983	23552	26719	-3167
Coleridge	E01017969	11310	14402	-3092

Ward	LSOA code (2011)	2015 IDAOP Rank	2010 IDAOP Rank	Positive Change
Romsey	E01017999	13240	5340	7900
Trumpington	E01018003	27986	21717	6269
Arbury	E01017950	28546	22750	5796
Kings Hedges	E01017980	25369	20845	4524
Kings Hedges	E01017979	7887	3702	4185
Abbey	E01017943	26212	22441	3771

9. OAC Portraits Description of the City's 20% (worst) LSOAs IMD 2015

Chart 3: LSOAs in 20% national IMD decile showing OAC characteristics

ONS Output Area Classification provides an insight into the type of communities that make-up an area. The classification reflects over 60 different Census findings to give a broad feel for a community but does not reflect everyone living within it.

A clickable OAC Map can be found here: http://www.maptube.org/map.aspx?mapid=960

4a1 – Social renting young families

This subgroup, when compared with the parent group, has a higher proportion of children aged 5 to 14, a higher proportion of people who have Pakistani ethnicity, and a higher proportion who were born in the UK or Ireland. Households are more likely to live in semi-detached properties, and to live in social rented accommodation. Unemployment is more prevalent when compared with the parent group.

4a2 – Private renting new arrivals

When compared with the group, this population of this subgroup has a lower proportion of people who have Black or of mixed ethnicity. Residents are more likely to have been born in other EU countries. Households are more likely to be living in private rented accommodation.

7a2 – Hampered aspiration

The population of this subgroup has a lower representation of people of mixed ethnicity or of Black ethnicity when compared with the parent group. A higher proportion of households live in terraced houses and in privately rented accommodation when compared with the parent group. A higher proportion of people work in the information and communication, financial, and public administration related industries.

7a3 – Multi-ethnic hardship

The age make-up of this subgroup is higher in the 5 to 14 age group when compared with the parent group. Whilst there are higher proportions of people of mixed or Black ethnicity, all ethnic groups are well represented, though a lower proportion of people were born in other EU countries. Households were more likely to live in semi-detached properties and were more likely to live in socially rented accommodation. Workers were more likely to be employed in transport or storage industries.

4c1 – Achieving minorities

The population of this subgroup has a higher proportion of people who have Pakistani ethnicity, and lower proportions with Chinese and Black ethnicity than the parent group. A lower proportion of residents were born in other EU countries. Households are more likely to live in detached and semi-detached properties, and to own their own property. Households are also less likely to live in overcrowded conditions.

3d2 – Established tech workers

The population of this subgroup is slightly more likely to have Black ethnicity and more likely to be born in the UK or Ireland, and to have non-dependent children. There is a higher proportion of households who live in terraced housing, and a higher proportion living in socially rented accommodation. Households are also less likely to live in overcrowded conditions.

2a3 – Students and professionals

The population in this subgroup contains higher proportions of children aged 0 to 14, and adults aged 25 and over than the parent group. The subgroup has a lower proportion of people living in communal establishments than the parent group, with higher proportions of people who are married or separated.

10. ACORN Consumer Classifications for 10 highest Ranked LSOAs

Acorn is a geodemographic segmentation of the UK's population. It segments households, postcodes and neighbourhoods into 6 categories, 18 groups and 62 types. By analysing significant social factors and population behaviour, it provides precise information and an in-depth understanding of the different types of people.

The User Guide (available to download at www.caci.co.uk/acorn) looks at each Acorn type across a wide range of demographic, behavioural and attitudinal attributes. The descriptions of each category, group and type provide an overview of the wider range of topics for which information is available.

Chart 4: E01017948 Profile

Acorn Group Description	Profile	%	Base	% Penetration	%Z-Score	Index
1. Affluent Achievers						
1.A Lavish Lifestyles	0	0.0	982	2.0	0.0	-4	0
1.B Executive Wealth	0	0.0	5,244	10.9	0.0	-9	0
1.C Mature Money	0	0.0	3,344	7.0	0.0	-7	0
2. Rising Prosperity						
2.D City Sophisticates	0	0.0	6,232	13.0	0.0	-10	0
2.E Career Climbers	0	0.0	5,883	12.3	0.0	-10	0
3. Comfortable Communities						
3.F Countryside Communities	0	0.0	30	0.1	0.0	-1	0
3.G Successful Suburbs	0	0.0	866	1.8	0.0	-4	0
3.H Steady Neighbourhoods	31	4.4	2,121	4.4	1.5	0	100
3.I Comfortable Seniors	0	0.0	607	1.3	0.0	-3	0
3.J Starting Out	74	10.6	6,139	12.8	1.2	-2	83
4. Financially Stretched						
4.K Student Life	0	0.0	2,228	4.6	0.0	-6	0
4.L Modest Means	37	5.3	890	1.9	4.2	7	286
4.M Striving Families	23	3.3	3,178	6.6	0.7	-4	50
4.N Poorer Pensioners	140	20.1	2,558	5.3	5.5	17	376
5. Urban Adversity						
5.O Young Hardship	44	6.3	2,353	4.9	1.9	2	128
5.P Struggling Estates	129	18.5	2,273	4.7	5.7	17	390
5.Q Difficult Circumstances	220	31.5	2,918	6.1	7.5	28	518
6. Not Private Households						
6.R Not Private Households	0	0.0	107	0.2	0.0	-1	0
Total	698		47,953		1.5		

ACORN Group Profile

Profile = Dark Shade
Base = Light Shade

Chart 5: E01017946 Profile

Acorn Group Description	Profile	%	Base	% Penetration	%Z-Score	Index	0	100	200
1. Affluent Achievers									
1.A Lavish Lifestyles	0	0.0	382	2.0	0.0	-4	0		
1.B Executive Wealth	0	0.0	5,244	10.9	0.0	-9	0		
1.C Mature Money	16	2.5	3,344	7.0	0.5	-4	35		
2. Rising Prosperity									
2.D City Sophisticates	0	0.0	6,232	13.0	0.0	-10	0		
2.E Career Climbers	67	10.4	5,883	12.3	1.1	-1	84		
3. Comfortable Communities									
3.F Countryside Communities	0	0.0	30	0.1	0.0	-1	0		
3.G Successful Suburbs	0	0.0	866	1.8	0.0	-3	0		
3.H Steady Neighbourhoods	57	8.8	2,121	4.4	2.7	5	199		
3.I Comfortable Seniors	0	0.0	607	1.3	0.0	-3	0		
3.J Starting Out	57	8.8	6,139	12.8	0.9	-3	69		
4. Financially Stretched									
4.K Student Life	0	0.0	2,228	4.6	0.0	-6	0		
4.L Modest Means	0	0.0	890	1.9	0.0	-3	0		
4.M Striving Families	53	8.2	3,178	6.6	1.7	2	124		
4.N Poorer Pensioners	68	10.5	2,558	5.3	2.7	6	197		
5. Urban Adversity									
5.O Young Hardship	106	16.4	2,353	4.9	4.5	14	334		
5.P Struggling Estates	210	32.5	2,273	4.7	9.2	33	685		
5.Q Difficult Circumstances	13	2.0	2,918	6.1	0.4	-4	33		
6. Not Private Households									
6.R Not Private Households	0	0.0	107	0.2	0.0	-1	0		
Total	**647**		**47,953**		**1.3**				

ACORN Group Profile

Profile = Dark Shade
Base = Light Shade

Chart 6: E01017975 Profile

1. Affluent Achievers							
1.A Lavish Lifestyles	0	0.0	982	2.0	0.0	-4	0
1.B Executive Wealth	0	0.0	5,244	10.9	0.0	-9	0
1.C Mature Money	0	0.0	3,344	7.0	0.0	-7	0
2. Rising Prosperity							
2.D City Sophisticates	0	0.0	6,232	13.0	0.0	-10	0
2.E Career Climbers	0	0.0	5,883	12.3	0.0	-10	0
3. Comfortable Communities							
3.F Countryside Communities	0	0.0	30	0.1	0.0	-1	0
3.G Successful Suburbs	0	0.0	866	1.8	0.0	-3	0
3.H Steady Neighbourhoods	0	0.0	2,121	4.4	0.0	-6	0
3.I Comfortable Seniors	0	0.0	607	1.3	0.0	-3	0
3.J Starting Out	43	6.6	6,139	12.8	0.7	-5	51
4. Financially Stretched							
4.K Student Life	0	0.0	2,228	4.6	0.0	-6	0
4.L Modest Means	0	0.0	890	1.9	0.0	-4	0
4.M Striving Families	337	51.5	3,178	6.6	10.6	46	776
4.N Poorer Pensioners	27	4.1	2,558	5.3	1.1	-1	77
5. Urban Adversity							
5.O Young Hardship	138	21.1	2,353	4.9	5.9	19	429
5.P Struggling Estates	0	0.0	2,273	4.7	0.0	-6	0
5.Q Difficult Circumstances	110	16.8	2,918	6.1	3.8	11	276
6. Not Private Households							
6.R Not Private Households	0	0.0	107	0.2	0.0	-1	0
Total	655		47,953		1.4		

ACORN Group Profile

Profile = Dark Shade
Base = Light Shade

Chart 7: E01017977 Profile

Acorn Group Description	Profile	%	Base	% Penetration	%Z-Score	Index	0	100	200
1. Affluent Achievers									
1.A Lavish Lifestyles	0	0.0	382	2.0	0.0	-4	0		
1.B Executive Wealth	26	3.1	5,244	10.9	0.5	-7	28		
1.C Mature Money	0	0.0	3,344	7.0	0.0	-8	0		
2. Rising Prosperity									
2.D City Sophisticates	0	0.0	6,232	13.0	0.0	-11	0		
2.E Career Climbers	53	6.3	5,883	12.3	0.9	-5	52		
3. Comfortable Communities									
3.F Countryside Communities	0	0.0	30	0.1	0.0	-1	0		
3.G Successful Suburbs	0	0.0	866	1.8	0.0	-4	0		
3.H Steady Neighbourhoods	0	0.0	2,121	4.4	0.0	-6	0		
3.I Comfortable Seniors	0	0.0	607	1.3	0.0	-3	0		
3.J Starting Out	0	0.0	6,139	12.8	0.0	-11	0		
4. Financially Stretched									
4.K Student Life	247	29.5	2,228	4.6	11.1	34	634		
4.L Modest Means	31	3.7	890	1.9	3.5	4	199		
4.M Striving Families	114	13.6	3,178	6.6	3.6	8	205		
4.N Poorer Pensioners	5	0.6	2,558	5.3	0.2	-6	11		
5. Urban Adversity									
5.O Young Hardship	68	8.1	2,353	4.9	2.9	4	165		
5.P Struggling Estates	37	4.4	2,273	4.7	1.6	0	93		
5.Q Difficult Circumstances	257	30.7	2,918	6.1	8.8	30	504		
6. Not Private Households									
6.R Not Private Households	0	0.0	107	0.2	0.0	-1	0		
Total	838		47,953	1.7					

ACORN Group Profile

- 1.A Lavish Lifestyles
- 1.B Executive Wealth
- 1.C Mature Money
- 2.D City Sophisticates
- 2.E Career Climbers
- 3.F Countryside Communities
- 3.G Successful Suburbs
- 3.H Steady Neighbourhoods
- 3.I Comfortable Seniors
- 3.J Starting Out
- 4.K Student Life
- 4.L Modest Means
- 4.M Striving Families
- 4.N Poorer Pensioners
- 5.O Young Hardship
- 5.P Struggling Estates
- 5.Q Difficult Circumstances
- 6.R Not Private Households

ACORN Group

Profile = Dark Shade

0.00% 5.00% 10.00% 15.00% 20.00% 25.00% 30.00% 35.00%

Chart 8: E01017952 Profile

Acorn Group Description	Profile	%	Base	% Penetration	%Z-Score	Index	0 100 200
1. Affluent Achievers							
1.A Lavish Lifestyles	0	0.0	382	2.0	0.0	-4	0
1.B Executive Wealth	0	0.0	5,244	10.9	0.0	-9	0
1.C Mature Money	63	9.5	3,344	7.0	1.9	3	136
2. Rising Prosperity							
2.D City Sophisticates	0	0.0	6,232	13.0	0.0	-10	0
2.E Career Climbers	0	0.0	5,883	12.3	0.0	-10	0
3. Comfortable Communities							
3.F Countryside Communities	0	0.0	30	0.1	0.0	-1	0
3.G Successful Suburbs	29	4.4	866	1.8	3.3	5	241
3.H Steady Neighbourhoods	36	5.4	2,121	4.4	1.7	1	122
3.I Comfortable Seniors	0	0.0	607	1.3	0.0	-3	0
3.J Starting Out	28	4.2	6,139	12.8	0.5	-7	33
4. Financially Stretched							
4.K Student Life	0	0.0	2,228	4.6	0.0	-6	0
4.L Modest Means	33	5.0	890	1.9	3.7	6	267
4.M Striving Families	117	17.6	3,178	6.6	3.7	11	265
4.N Poorer Pensioners	48	7.2	2,558	5.3	1.9	2	135
5. Urban Adversity							
5.O Young Hardship	69	10.4	2,353	4.9	2.9	7	211
5.P Struggling Estates	38	5.7	2,273	4.7	1.7	1	121
5.Q Difficult Circumstances	204	30.7	2,918	6.1	7.0	27	504
6. Not Private Households							
6.R Not Private Households	0	0.0	107	0.2	0.0	-1	0
Total	665		47,953		1.4		

ACORN Group Profile

Profile = Dark Shade
Base = Light Shade

Chart 9: E01017944 Profile

Acorn Group Description	Profile	%	Base	% Penetration	%Z-Score	Index	0	100	200
1. Affluent Achievers									
1.A Lavish Lifestyles	0	0.0	982	2.0	0.0	-4	0		
1.B Executive Wealth	0	0.0	5,244	10.9	0.0	-9	0		
1.C Mature Money	0	0.0	3,344	7.0	0.0	-7	0		
2. Rising Prosperity									
2.D City Sophisticates	0	0.0	6,232	13.0	0.0	-9	0		
2.E Career Climbers	31	5.2	5,883	12.3	0.5	-5	42		
3. Comfortable Communities									
3.F Countryside Communities	0	0.0	30	0.1	0.0	-1	0		
3.G Successful Suburbs	0	0.0	866	1.8	0.0	-3	0		
3.H Steady Neighbourhoods	69	11.6	2,121	4.4	3.3	8	261		
3.I Comfortable Seniors	0	0.0	607	1.3	0.0	-3	0		
3.J Starting Out	0	0.0	6,139	12.8	0.0	-9	0		
4. Financially Stretched									
4.K Student Life	22	3.7	2,228	4.6	1.0	-1	79		
4.L Modest Means	126	21.1	890	1.9	14.2	35	1137		
4.M Striving Families	121	20.3	3,178	6.6	3.8	13	306		
4.N Poorer Pensioners	0	0.0	2,558	5.3	0.0	-6	0		
5. Urban Adversity									
5.O Young Hardship	90	15.1	2,353	4.9	3.8	12	307		
5.P Struggling Estates	0	0.0	2,273	4.7	0.0	-5	0		
5.Q Difficult Circumstances	138	23.1	2,918	6.1	4.7	17	380		
6. Not Private Households									
6.R Not Private Households	0	0.0	107	0.2	0.0	-1	0		
Total	**597**		**47,953**		1.2				

ACORN Group Profile

Profile = Dark Shade
Base = Light Shade

%

Chart 10: E01017971 Profile

Acorn Group Description	Profile	%	Base	% Penetration	%Z-Score	Index	0	100	200
1. Affluent Achievers									
1.A Lavish Lifestyles	0	0.0	382	2.0	0.0	-4	0		
1.B Executive Wealth	0	0.0	5,244	10.9	0.0	-10	0		
1.C Mature Money	15	2.0	3,344	7.0	0.4	-5	29		
2. Rising Prosperity									
2.D City Sophisticates	0	0.0	6,232	13.0	0.0	-11	0		
2.E Career Climbers	30	4.1	5,883	12.3	0.5	-7	33		
3. Comfortable Communities									
3.F Countryside Communities	0	0.0	30	0.1	0.0	-1	0		
3.G Successful Suburbs	0	0.0	866	1.8	0.0	-4	0		
3.H Steady Neighbourhoods	0	0.0	2,121	4.4	0.0	-6	0		
3.I Comfortable Seniors	0	0.0	607	1.3	0.0	-3	0		
3.J Starting Out	85	11.5	6,139	12.8	1.4	-1	90		
4. Financially Stretched									
4.K Student Life	0	0.0	2,228	4.6	0.0	-6	0		
4.L Modest Means	38	5.1	890	1.9	4.3	7	277		
4.M Striving Families	92	12.4	3,178	6.6	2.9	6	188		
4.N Poorer Pensioners	73	9.9	2,558	5.3	2.9	5	185		
5. Urban Adversity									
5.O Young Hardship	68	9.2	2,353	4.9	2.9	5	187		
5.P Struggling Estates	211	28.5	2,273	4.7	9.3	30	602		
5.Q Difficult Circumstances	103	13.9	2,918	6.1	3.5	9	229		
6. Not Private Households									
6.R Not Private Households	25	3.4	107	0.2	23.4	18	1514		
Total	740		47,953		1.5				

ACORN Group Profile

Profile = Dark Shade
Base = Light Shade

%

23

Chart 11: E01017978 Profile

Acorn Group Description	Profile	%	Base	% Penetration	%Z-Score	Index	0	100	200
1. Affluent Achievers									
1.A Lavish Lifestyles	0	0.0	982	2.0	0.0	-4	0		
1.B Executive Wealth	0	0.0	5,244	10.9	0.0	-9	0		
1.C Mature Money	0	0.0	3,344	7.0	0.0	-7	0		
2. Rising Prosperity									
2.D City Sophisticates	0	0.0	6,232	13.0	0.0	-10	0		
2.E Career Climbers	2	0.3	5,883	12.3	0.0	-10	2		
3. Comfortable Communities									
3.F Countryside Communities	0	0.0	30	0.1	0.0	-1	0		
3.G Successful Suburbs	0	0.0	866	1.8	0.0	-4	0		
3.H Steady Neighbourhoods	0	0.0	2,121	4.4	0.0	-6	0		
3.I Comfortable Seniors	0	0.0	607	1.3	0.0	-3	0		
3.J Starting Out	92	13.5	6,133	12.8	1.5	1	106		
4. Financially Stretched									
4.K Student Life	0	0.0	2,228	4.6	0.0	-6	0		
4.L Modest Means	0	0.0	890	1.9	0.0	-4	0		
4.M Striving Families	61	9.0	3,178	6.6	1.9	2	135		
4.N Poorer Pensioners	76	11.2	2,558	5.3	3.0	7	209		
5. Urban Adversity									
5.O Young Hardship	140	20.6	2,353	4.9	5.9	19	419		
5.P Struggling Estates	86	12.6	2,273	4.7	3.8	10	266		
5.Q Difficult Circumstances	224	32.9	2,918	6.1	7.7	29	541		
6. Not Private Households									
6.R Not Private Households	0	0.0	107	0.2	0.0	-1	0		
Total	**681**		**47,953**		**1.4**				

ACORN Group Profile

Profile = Dark Shade

Chart 12: E01017979 Profile

Acorn Group Description	Profile	%	Base	% Penetration	%Z-Score	Index	0 100 200
1. Affluent Achievers							
1.A Lavish Lifestyles	0	0.0	382	2.0	0.0	-4	0
1.B Executive Wealth	0	0.0	5,244	10.9	0.0	-9	0
1.C Mature Money	0	0.0	3,344	7.0	0.0	-7	0
2. Rising Prosperity							
2.D City Sophisticates	0	0.0	6,232	13.0	0.0	-10	0
2.E Career Climbers	0	0.0	5,883	12.3	0.0	-10	0
3. Comfortable Communities							
3.F Countryside Communities	0	0.0	30	0.1	0.0	-1	0
3.G Successful Suburbs	0	0.0	866	1.8	0.0	-4	0
3.H Steady Neighbourhoods	0	0.0	2,121	4.4	0.0	-6	0
3.I Comfortable Seniors	0	0.0	607	1.3	0.0	-3	0
3.J Starting Out	0	0.0	6,139	12.8	0.0	-10	0
4. Financially Stretched							
4.K Student Life	0	0.0	2,228	4.6	0.0	-6	0
4.L Modest Means	0	0.0	890	1.9	0.0	-4	0
4.M Striving Families	50	7.4	3,178	6.6	1.6	1	112
4.N Poorer Pensioners	37	5.5	2,558	5.3	1.4	0	103
5. Urban Adversity							
5.O Young Hardship	245	36.3	2,353	4.9	10.4	38	740
5.P Struggling Estates	7	1.0	2,273	4.7	0.3	-5	22
5.Q Difficult Circumstances	316	46.8	2,918	6.1	10.8	44	769
6. Not Private Households							
6.R Not Private Households	20	3.0	107	0.2	18.7	15	1328
Total	675		47,953		1.4		

ACORN Group Profile

Profile = Dark Shade

Chart 13: E01017953

Acorn Group Description	Profile	%	Base	% Penetration	%Z-Score	Index	0	100	200
1. Affluent Achievers									
1.A Lavish Lifestyles	0	0.0	382	2.0	0.0	-4	0		
1.B Executive Wealth	44	6.4	5,244	10.9	0.8	-4	58		
1.C Mature Money	132	19.2	3,344	7.0	3.9	13	275		
2. Rising Prosperity									
2.D City Sophisticates	0	0.0	6,232	13.0	0.0	-10	0		
2.E Career Climbers	0	0.0	5,883	12.3	0.0	-10	0		
3. Comfortable Communities									
3.F Countryside Communities	0	0.0	30	0.1	0.0	-1	0		
3.G Successful Suburbs	21	3.0	866	1.8	2.4	2	163		
3.H Steady Neighbourhoods	7	1.0	2,121	4.4	0.3	-4	23		
3.I Comfortable Seniors	103	14.9	607	1.3	17.0	32	1161		
3.J Starting Out	18	2.6	6,139	12.8	0.3	-8	20		
4. Financially Stretched									
4.K Student Life	0	0.0	2,228	4.6	0.0	-6	0		
4.L Modest Means	0	0.0	890	1.9	0.0	-4	0		
4.M Striving Families	37	5.4	3,178	6.6	1.2	-1	81		
4.N Poorer Pensioners	50	7.3	2,558	5.3	2.0	2	136		
5. Urban Adversity									
5.O Young Hardship	88	12.8	2,353	4.9	3.7	10	260		
5.P Struggling Estates	172	25.0	2,273	4.7	7.6	25	527		
5.Q Difficult Circumstances	17	2.5	2,918	6.1	0.6	-4	41		
6. Not Private Households									
6.R Not Private Households	0	0.0	107	0.2	0.0	-1	0		
Total	**689**		**47,953**		**1.4**				

ACORN Group Profile

Profile = Dark Shade
Base = Light Shade

ACORN Group (vertical axis): 1.A Lavish Lifestyles, 1.B Executive Wealth, 1.C Mature Money, 2.D City Sophisticates, 2.E Career Climbers, 3.F Countryside Communities, 3.G Successful Suburbs, 3.H Steady Neighbourhoods, 3.I Comfortable Seniors, 3.J Starting Out, 4.K Student Life, 4.L Modest Means, 4.M Striving Families, 4.N Poorer Pensioners, 5.O Young Hardship, 5.P Struggling Estates, 5.Q Difficult Circumstances, 6.R Not Private Households

% (horizontal axis): 0.00%, 5.00%, 10.00%, 15.00%, 20.00%, 25.00%, 30.00%

11. Cambridge IMD Domains

The domains making up the Index of Multiple Deprivation are shown below in Chart 3.

Chart 14:

The weights for each domain were derived from consideration of the academic literature on poverty and deprivation, as well as the levels of robustness of the indicators. Each of these domains is based on a basket of indicators. As far as is possible, each indicator is based on data from the most recent time point available; in practice most indicators in the Indices of Deprivation 2015 relate to the tax year 2012/13.

The national indices of **deprivation explorer** allows an investigation of the domains in more depth. It can be found here: http://dclgapps.communities.gov.uk/imd/idmap.html

The domains scores for Cambridge City Council, as a local authority district, are shown in Chart 4, below. As a reminder there are 326 local authority districts included in IMD 2015, so the ranking score for each district domain is out 326, with 326th being the least deprived and 1 the most deprived.

It can be seen that whilst the Cambridge City local authority district domains scores are amongst the least deprived the "Living Environment Domain", "Barriers to Housing Services Domain" and "Crime Score" are lower. Our Living Environment Deprivation score is at 15% of the most deprived local authorities. The domain is made-up of indicators that include: houses without central heating; houses in a poor condition; air quality and road traffic accidents involving injury to pedestrians and cyclists.

Chart 15: Scores for Cambridge Domains of Deprivation

12. A Closer look at the Living Environment Domain (Worst City Domain)

Map 11, below, extracted from the deprivation explorer, shows that we have six LSOAs (purple) that are in the worst 10% nationally for the "Living Environment Domain". The worst scoring indicators that make-up the domain are pointing towards the LSOAs with the lowest rankings for these indicators. It seems that the "Outdoor Living" component of the domain, which consists of air quality and road traffic indicators are pushing this domain higher because these indicators have a greater comparative ranking.

- Air quality is an estimate of the concentration of four pollutants and is based on 2012 figures. The score for the LSOA is 1.24 with the worst nationally at 2.301
- Road traffic accidents are based on accidents that involve death or personal injury to a pedestrian or cyclist and is a rate per 1,000. The score is 2.55 for the LSOA with the worst nationally at 7.204. Housing without central heating is a measure of houses that are expensive to heat and is 0.054 for the LSOA with the worst nationally at 0.338.
- Housing in a poor condition is a modelled estimate of the proportion of social and private homes that fail to meet the Decent Homes standard. The score for the LSOA is 0.441 with the worst nationally 0.955.

13. Looking at Cambridge IMD Domains by Ward

There are usually six LSOAs in each ward with an average of roughly 1,500 residents and 650 households in an LSOA.

The following maps (12 – 26) show the location of each LSOA in a ward, with its identifying number, and the charts show, in the form of a "spider diagram", how each LSOA scores across 10 domains.

Map 12: Abbey Ward

Map 13: Arbury Ward

Map 14: Castle Ward

Map 15: Cherry Hinton Ward

Map 16: Coleridge Ward

# Map 17: East Chesterton Ward

Map 18: Kings Hedges Ward

Map 19: Market Ward

## Map 20: Newnham Ward

## Map 21: Petersfield Ward

Map 22: Queen Ediths Ward

Map 23: Romsey Ward

Map 24: Trumpington Ward

Map 25: West Chesterton

14. Data Tables

Cambridge LSOA IMD Rankings

Ward	LSOA code (2011)	IMD Rank 2015	IMD Rank 2010	Change
Abbey	E01017948	5,578	6769	-1,191
Abbey	E01017946	5,861	6925	-1,064
Kings Hedges	E01017975	8,245	7111	1,134
Kings Hedges	E01017977	8,340	9208	-868
Arbury	E01017952	8,539	7977	562
Abbey	E01017944	8,888	9636	-748
East Chesterton	E01017971	9,078	7949	1,129
Kings Hedges	E01017978	9,123	6152	2,971
Kings Hedges	E01017979	9,579	5942	3,637
Arbury	E01017953	12,426	11556	870
Abbey	E01017947	12,959	11503	1,456
Petersfield	E01017991	13,158	11253	1,905
East Chesterton	E01017974	14,030	9506	4,524
West Chesterton	E01018009	14,056	10498	3,558
Abbey	E01017945	14,080	11119	2,961
East Chesterton	E01017972	14,219	10979	3,240
Arbury	E01017954	15,381	15118	263
Cherry Hinton	E01017960	15,598	13691	1,907
Romsey	E01017997	15,748	16080	-332
Arbury	E01017949	16,011	12769	3,242
Arbury	E01017951	16,500	14468	2,032
Romsey	E01017999	16,611	11108	5,503
Cherry Hinton	E01017961	16,734	16082	652
Trumpington	E01018005	16,831	12815	4,016
East Chesterton	E01017973	17,080	13611	3,469
Coleridge	E01017967	18,013	10246	7,767
Abbey	E01017943	19,496	20692	-1,196
Cherry Hinton	E01017962	19,566	16391	3,175
Coleridge	E01017969	20,164	21058	-894
Queen Ediths	E01017994	20,169	18939	1,230
Coleridge	E01017965	20,736	20554	182
Cherry Hinton	E01017963	20,785	15078	5,707
Kings Hedges	E01017976	20,829	18333	2,496
Trumpington	E01018002	21,114	20817	297
Kings Hedges	E01017980	21,713	17835	3,878
Petersfield	E01017989	23,129	16413	6,716
Trumpington	E01018003	23,284	22708	576
Coleridge	E01017966	23,555	22690	865
Petersfield	E01017987	24,222	18421	5,801
Romsey	E01018000	24,340	23642	698
Queen Ediths	E01017992	24,659	21542	3,117

Romsey	E01018001	25,197	20743	4,454
Newnham	E01017984	25,496	30447	-4,951
Arbury	E01017950	25,722	22015	3,707
Castle	E01017956	25,735	27255	-1,520
Petersfield	E01017990	26,147	22103	4,044
Market	E01017983	26,205	19417	6,788
Castle	E01017958	26,649	25032	1,617
West Chesterton	E01018010	26,716	23859	2,857
Romsey	E01017998	27,039	24694	2,345
West Chesterton	E01018008	27,751	23189	4,562
Queen Ediths	E01017993	28,013	26425	1,588
Petersfield	E01017988	28,276	24070	4,206
Coleridge	E01017968	28,403	24617	3,786
West Chesterton	E01018006	28,502	26820	1,682
Castle	E01017957	29,806	29403	403
Newnham	E01017986	30,254	27504	2,750
Newnham	E01017985	31,020	29978	1,042
Queen Ediths	E01017996	31,094	29496	1,598
Cherry Hinton	E01017959	31,096	27598	3,498
Castle	E01017955	31,229	29850	1,379
West Chesterton	E01018007	31,434	29124	2,310
Queen Ediths	E01017995	31,931	31041	890
Cherry Hinton	E01017964	32,287	30360	1,927

Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI)

Ward	LSOA code (2011)	2015 IDACI Rank	2010 IDACI Rank	Change
Abbey	E01017948	4963	4802	161
Kings Hedges	E01017975	5399	6478	-1079
East Chesterton	E01017971	6059	5316	743
Kings Hedges	E01017978	6322	4249	2073
Arbury	E01017954	6923	8711	-1788
East Chesterton	E01017974	8204	6184	2020
Kings Hedges	E01017979	8519	7041	1478
Arbury	E01017952	8990	9318	-328
East Chesterton	E01032802	9341		
Arbury	E01017953	9481	7118	2363
Abbey	E01017947	9606	13544	-3938
Abbey	E01017944	9714	6601	3113
Kings Hedges	E01017977	9802	10997	-1195
Abbey	E01017946	10765	8834	1931
East Chesterton	E01017972	10790	6919	3871
Cherry Hinton	E01017960	11308	11082	226
East Chesterton	E01017973	12020	7296	4724
Castle	E01017958	12906	17112	-4206
Abbey	E01017943	13136	8573	4563
Petersfield	E01017991	13460	11709	1751
Queen Ediths	E01017994	14285	13326	959
Romsey	E01017999	14454	11241	3213
Abbey	E01017945	14668	10682	3986
Romsey	E01017997	15541	10491	5050
Cherry Hinton	E01017962	16383	10762	5621
Cherry Hinton	E01017963	17084	15241	1843
Coleridge	E01017967	17197	12862	4335
West Chesterton	E01018009	17207	15681	1526
Cherry Hinton	E01017961	17519	15624	1895
Trumpington	E01032795	17620	29214	
Trumpington	E01018002	17710	19819	-2109
East Chesterton	E01032792	17768	6919	
Coleridge	E01017969	18125	21448	-3323
Coleridge	E01017965	18435	16905	1530
Arbury	E01017949	18973	15799	3174

Kings Hedges	E01017980	19248	14421	4827
Trumpington	E01018003	20072	16783	3289
Arbury	E01017951	20621	18136	2485
Kings Hedges	E01017976	21701	24453	-2752
Queen Ediths	E01017992	21954	18686	3268
Queen Ediths	E01017993	22438	23189	-751
Petersfield	E01017989	23181	15818	7363
Castle	E01017955	24746	24393	353
Coleridge	E01017966	25073	19062	6011
Trumpington	E01018005	25097	18860	6237
Petersfield	E01017987	25285	18418	6867
West Chesterton	E01018010	25356	32219	-6863
Romsey	E01017998	25821	25612	209
Trumpington	E01032794	26011	31402	
Romsey	E01018000	27992	24251	3741
Market	E01032797	28155	20815	
Cherry Hinton	E01017959	28486	24677	3809
Romsey	E01018001	29064	26805	2259
Petersfield	E01017990	29119	22555	6564
Newnham	E01017986	29364	29348	16
Queen Ediths	E01017995	29607	30967	-1360
Newnham	E01017985	30006	21680	8326
Cherry Hinton	E01017964	30345	27078	3267
Arbury	E01017950	30405	23500	6905
West Chesterton	E01018008	30533	27953	2580
Market	E01017983	30773	21684	9089
Newnham	E01017984	31239	28898	2341
Coleridge	E01017968	31370	27922	3448
Petersfield	E01017988	31376	32098	-722
West Chesterton	E01018006	31552	27172	4380
West Chesterton	E01018007	31777	31872	-95
Queen Ediths	E01017996	31812	32266	-454
Castle	E01017957	32372	32056	316
Castle	E01017956	32547	32157	390

Income Deprivation Affecting Older People Index (IDAOP)

Ward	LSOA code (2011)	2015 IDAOPI Rank	2010 IDAOPI Rank	Change
Kings Hedges	E01017978	6374	7015	-641
Abbey	E01017948	7686	7336	350
Kings Hedges	E01017979	7887	3702	4185
Castle	E01017958	7899	6074	1825
Coleridge	E01017965	8860	9871	-1011
Kings Hedges	E01017977	8961	10473	-1512
Petersfield	E01017991	9027	8078	949
East Chesterton	E01017974	9158	11043	-1885
Cherry Hinton	E01017961	9209	12555	-3346
East Chesterton	E01017971	9603	9818	-215
Abbey	E01017944	10345	14345	-4000
Arbury	E01017949	11217	16089	-4872
Coleridge	E01017969	11310	14402	-3092
Abbey	E01017946	11794	11093	701
Coleridge	E01017967	12116	14875	-2759
Abbey	E01017945	12219	14044	-1825
Arbury	E01017953	12370	12810	-440
Romsey	E01017998	12610	12145	465
Petersfield	E01017989	12690	9331	3359
Arbury	E01017952	12786	13607	-821
West Chesterton	E01032802	12803	0	
Romsey	E01017999	13240	5340	7900
Kings Hedges	E01017975	13544	12733	811
Queen Ediths	E01017992	13992	11745	2247
East Chesterton	E01017973	14549	13115	1434
Coleridge	E01017966	14891	17634	-2743
Cherry Hinton	E01017960	15496	12532	2964
Arbury	E01017954	16209	17851	-1642

Coleridge	E01017968	17359	17681	-322
East Chesterton	E01032792	17381	0	
West Chesterton	E01018009	17809	17635	174
Romsey	E01017997	17990	16472	1518
Cherry Hinton	E01017963	18195	15706	2489
Cherry Hinton	E01017962	19454	20207	-753
West Chesterton	E01018006	19600	25348	-5748
Arbury	E01017951	19646	20452	-806
Trumpington	E01018005	20436	17046	3390
Queen Ediths	E01017994	20590	19424	1166
Abbey	E01017947	20622	17144	3478
Kings Hedges	E01017976	21097	20497	600
Petersfield	E01017990	21394	18313	3081
Trumpington	E01018002	21656	20100	1556
Trumpington	E01032795	22105	0	
East Chesterton	E01017972	22290	18642	3648
Romsey	E01018000	22743	24960	-2217
Market	E01017983	23552	26719	-3167
Romsey	E01018001	24397	21119	3278
Market	E01032797	24476	0	
Petersfield	E01017987	25238	23909	1329
Kings Hedges	E01017980	25369	20845	4524
Abbey	E01017943	26212	22441	3771
Trumpington	E01018003	27986	21717	6269
Castle	E01017955	28127	28967	-840
Arbury	E01017950	28546	22750	5796
West Chesterton	E01018008	29564	26568	2996
Trumpington	E01032794	29861	0	
Newnham	E01017985	30228	29219	1009
Cherry Hinton	E01017964	31069	30354	715
Petersfield	E01017988	31614	31569	45
West Chesterton	E01018010	31780	29624	2156
Castle	E01017957	31953	31075	878
Queen Ediths	E01017993	32015	31632	383
Castle	E01017956	32023	31886	137
Cherry Hinton	E01017959	32034	31685	349
Newnham	E01017986	32307	31751	556
Queen Ediths	E01017995	32659	32144	515
West Chesterton	E01018007	32714	32308	406

Queen Ediths	E01017996	32789	31500	1289
Newnham	E01017984	32816	32432	384