**Disabled people in Bolsover District and Chesterfield Borough – now and in the future plus Census data update.**

1. **Introduction.**

This paper seeks to explain why disabled people of working age (16-64) are such an important group in Bolsover District (BDC) and Chesterfield Borough (CBC).

2. **Who are disabled people?**

The Equality Act 2010 definition says:

People who have a physical or mental impairment that has a substantial and long term adverse effect on his/her ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities.

The definition is extremely wide ranging from people with cancer and HIV to some people with asthma and diabetes and even some who had a disability in the past.

3. **Reliability of data.**

Information should be treated with caution because there are gaps, comparison is not always possible as different sources used different questions, groups and timescales. Most of the data is from NOMIS, the Derbyshire Observatory and the 2001 Census (2011 data has not yet been released). The wording of questions about disability is prone to gain inaccurate responses: about 66% of people covered by the definition above may not label themselves as disabled people (Office for Disability Issues research).

4. **Summary: The high level of local disabled residents needs specific attention and action.**

* The 2001 Census showed the high level of unemployed disabled people in the populations of BDC and CBC due to their heavy industry and mining backgrounds. While the 2011 Census may show some improvement as some of these people pass retirement age, this may be partly offset by overall increase, extension and ageing of the working population.
* Recent data indicates that the high level is continuing and many unemployed disabled people face increased pressure to find work despite being older and long-term unemployed. Work Capability Assessments have particular impact locally due to the high level of unemployed disabled people and the initial trend that are being found “fit-to-work”. This is likely to increase the number of Job Seekers Allowance (JSA) claimants and change their characteristics as they will include more disabled people.
* Employment support providers need to tailor their services to overcome the low levels of transition-to-work for disabled people and their likely work barriers: individual circumstances, tight labour market, employer prejudice, economic downturn. Adequate health services for those with mental health conditions is also needed.
* Benefit changes may increase pressure on the local economy and individuals as some will lose current entitlements. Existing economic deprivation for disabled residents and their carers may extend in to old age. Work may not substantially improve their finances as many disabled people are unable to work full-time or may earn less than their non-disabled peers.
* Without long-term, concentrated and effective interventions, the high level of disabled people is likely to impact the local economies for decades to come.**Levels /numbers of disabled people locally.**

5. **High level of disabled people locally due to industrial legacy.**

* The proportion of local residents reporting limiting long-term illness in the 2001 Census was significantly high: About 26% BDC and 23% CBC (18% both East Midlands (EM) and England and Wales (E&W)).
* At that time, BDC had the highest level of disabled people of the region’s 40 Local Authorities and CBC was fourth highest.
* These high levels of disabled people were reflected in the working age population.

This is consistent with rates of disability being highest within areas with a legacy of heavy industry, especially coal mining.

6. **More disabled people in line with overall population growth trends.**

* The national population increase is well-recognised and is forecast to raise local populations to about 84,000 BDC and 112,000 CBC by 2033.

If the 2001 levels of disabled people continue, this would increase the number of disabled residents by some 3,000 in each area during the intervening decades.

7. **More working age disabled people due to national ageing trends.**

* The large majority (>70%) of disabled people acquire their impairments during their working lives.
* DWP figures suggest that propensity for disability increases from some 9% of those aged 16-24 to about 44% of those aged 50-65.

The aging local population will increase levels of disabled people.

8. **More working age disabled people due to later Retirement.**

* Women born after April 1953 are already subject to progressive increase of retirement age from 60 to 65 by 2020.
* For men and women, the Government plans to change the pension age to 66 by 2020 and to 67 by 2026/28.

Although the numbers are relatively small, there will be more people of “working age” by 2028 of whom some 44% may be disabled people.

**Economic consequences.**

9. **High level of unemployed disabled people nationally.**

* The onset of disabling conditions occurs during the working lives of most disabled people and most (80%) will have been working. But within a year, 20% will be unemployed followed by a further 24% in the subsequent year.
* In 2009, there were some 6.7m working age disabled people nationally of whom about 50% were unemployed (20% non-disabled people).
* The level of disabled workers in full-time jobs was only 33% (59% non-disabled workers).

Half of disabled people are not working and those who do work have difficulty getting full-time jobs.

10. **Even higher level of unemployed disabled people locally.**

* In 2001, the levels of permanently sick or disabled people within the working age population were at least double regional or national levels at about 10% BDC and 8% CBC (4% both EM and E&W) resulting in BDC being ranked highest in the region and CBC 5th.
* More recently, Employment and Support Allowance (ESA) has been replacing Incapacity Benefit (IB) as the unemployment benefit for disabled people. By 2012, the level of ESA claimants locally was still slightly higher at 3% in BDC and CBC (2% both EM and E&W).
* The significant difference is the level of those claiming older Incapacity Benefit or Severe Disablement Allowance: 7% BDC and 6% CBC (4% both EM and E&W).
* In broad terms, the current numbers of unemployed disabled people are about 4,500 BDC and 5,800 CBC compared with JSA claimants of 1,910 BDC and 3,010 CBC (ratios of unemployed disabled people to JSA claimants: 2.25 to 1 BDC and 1.9 to 1 CBC).
* The levels of JSA claimants (4%) and >12 months JSA claimants (1%) are comparable with regional and national levels.

Both areas have a legacy of higher levels of unemployed disabled people than regionally or nationally and more have been unemployed long-term with consequent impact on their work prospects. The JSA claimant count may be misleading as a measure of local economic improvement.

11. **More local disabled people required to seek work in the future.**

* The comparatively high levels of local Incapacity Benefit claimants and their circumstances are significant as all are progressively subject to the Work Capability Assessment which will find some fit for work (and so likely to transfer to Job Seekers Allowance), some who should undertake work –related activities having been transferred to Employment and Support Allowance (ESA) while other ESA-recipients are unlikely to work.
* Early limited data showed that higher levels of local IB claimants have been found fit for work: 48% BDC and 45% CBC (41% EM, 37% England) although many assessments are subject to appeal.

In the next few years, it is likely that the number of JSA claimants will increase and their characteristics change as more disabled people are found fit for work.

12. **Continuing need for specialist employment support.**

* These disabled JSA and ESA claimants face multiple challenges: disability, older age, low motivation, longer time out of work, out-dated work skills, limited local employment prospects and the national economic downturn.
* As an indicator of the scale of the challenge, there is data that suggests that the transition rate of disabled people from unemployment to work is some 6 times lower than that of their non-disabled peers.
* Support from Jobcentres and local organisations will achieve work for some while others will be subsequently referred to local Work Programme providers. The latter receive payment for sustainable work outcomes but substantive data will not be available for some time to show whether premiums attached to disabled people are effective.

Long-term specialist support will be needed in both areas to meet the level of demand which economic upturn is unlikely to reduce.

13. **Some disabilities increase employment difficulties.**

* Mental health conditions are very prevalent and have high impact on employment:
	+ For people aged under 65, about 50% of all ill health is mental illness.
	+ About 25% of the population have a mental health condition at any time.
	+ It is recognised that many disabled people acquire additional mental health conditions linked to unemployment.
	+ Only some 10% of people with mental health conditions are in employment.
* Some 3% of the population have learning disabilities and about 20% of them are in employment.

Access to effective mental health treatment plus other specialist support is needed.

14. **Disability is closely linked to deprivation.**

Against national indices of multiple deprivation, both areas have raised their positions to 58th BDC and 90th CBC over recent years. However, both still have several areas within the lowest national 20% for employment and health deprivation.

The typical pay gaps (6-26%) encountered by those disabled people who manage to work indicates that employment may not fully resolve their deprivation: they are twice as likely to be social housing tenants and some 60% are likely to live in households without access to a car (20% general population).

 15. **Some disabled people face reductions in disability benefits.**

* Disabled people’s cost of living can be 25% higher than non-disabled people due to their additional needs. Disability Living Allowance (DLA) was introduced to offset the extra cost and is payable regardless of whether the disabled person is working or not.
* The Government is proposing to change this benefit to Personal Independence Payments (PIP) in 2013. There has been some concern about the proposals which may result in, perhaps, 20% of current DLA recipients not being eligible for PIP.
* This is particularly significant locally with some 6,970 (11%) BDC and 8,240 (10%) CBC residents aged 0-64 claiming DLA in 2012 (8% EM, 6% England).

Potentially, some 1,400 BDC and 1,600 CBC residents are liable to lose their eligibility – alongside possible IB/ESA re-assessments too.

16. **More disabled people means more carers.**

* Care giving enriches society and can reduce demand on publicly funded support. But it can also limit the economic activity of the care givers.
* This is important for BDC and CBC (plus NEDDC) which are three of the four Districts with the highest rate of unpaid carers per head in the whole of England and Wales.
* This is reflected in the levels of people claiming Carer Allowance: 2% in both areas (1% EM and Great Britain).

Non-working carers multiply the economic consequences of disability.

17. **More unemployed disabled people means more future pensioner poverty.**

Some 55% disabled people reported having no savings (about 12% general population).

Disabled adults are twice as likely as their non-disabled peers to live in low income households.

People who have a limited work history (such as many disabled people) will often be reliant on state Retirement Pension rather than employment pensions.

National Age UK figures show that 46% pensioner couples and 73% single pensioners receive over half their income from state pensions and benefits.

1.8 Million pensioners (16%) live below the poverty line and over 3.5 million older people live in fuel poverty.

These levels of deprivation may be conservative for both areas where there are higher numbers of disabled people with limited work histories. Hence, the areas may see decades of pensioners on low incomes.
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**2011 Census data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Data** | **BDC** | **BDC %** | **CBC** | **CBC%** | **EM** | **EM%** | **Eng** | **Eng%** | **Notes** |
| All residents | 75k |  | 103k |  | 4.5m |  | 53m |  |  |
| Residents aged 16 - 64 | 48.4k |  | 66.3k |  | 2.9m |  | 34.3m |  |  |
| **Benefits**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Nov 2011 – working age claimants. |
| JSA | 1.7k | 19 | 2.7k | 22 | 103k | 26 | 1.2m | 26 | Percentages of working age claimants |
| IB | 4.5k | 50 | 5.8k | 48 | 177k | 44 | 2.1m | 44 | Includes ESA claimants |
| **Claimant age profiles** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Working age claimants. |
| 16-24 | 1.3k | 15 | 2k | 17 | 69k | 17 | 803k | 17 |  |
| 25-49 | 4.2k | 47 | 5.9k | 49 | 201k | 49 | 2.4m | 51 |  |
| 50 and over | 3.4k | 38 | 4.2k | 35 | 136k | 33 | 1.5m | 32 | 50 to respective retirement ages of men and women |
| **Health limitations – all residents.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Long-term health conditions limit day to day activities a lot/a little |
| Limited a lot  | 9.8k | 13 | 11.9k | 11.5 | 393k | 8.7 | 4.4m | 8.3% |  |
| Limited a little | 8.8k | 11.6 | 11.9k | 11.5 | 451k | 9.9 | 4.9m | 9.3 |  |
| Not limited | 57k | 75.3 | 79.8k | 76.9 | 3.6m | 81.3 | 43.6m | 82.3 |  |
| **Health limitations – working age.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16-64 |
| Limited a lot  | 4.4k | 9.2 | 5.4k | 8.2 | 167k | 5.7 | 1.9m | 5.6 |  |
| Limited a little  | 4.6k | 9.5 | 6k | 9.2 | 223k | 7.6 | 2.5m | 7.1 |  |
| Sum of Limited | 9k | 18.7 | 11.4k | 17.4 | 390k | 13.3 | 4.4m | 12.7 | Sum of rounded data |
| Not limited 16-64 | 39k | 81.4 | 54.8k | 83 | 2.5m | 86.6 | 29.9m | 87.2 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Provides unpaid care (various hours)** | 9.6k | 12.7 | 13k | 12.5 | 490.2k | 10.8 | 5.4m | 10.2 | Numbers/percentages of all residents providing care. |
| **Economic activity** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residents aged 16-74 | 55.9k |  | 76.4k |  | 3.3m |  | 38.8m |  |  |
| Total economically active | 37.4k | 66.9 | 51.9k | 67.9 | 2.3m | 69.2 | 27.1m | 69.9 | Includes: employees (FT and PT), self-employed (with or without employees), unemployed (actively seeking work), FT students. |
| Economically inactive | 18.5k | 33 | 24.5k | 32 | 1m | 30.7 | 11.6m | 30 | Includes: retired, student, looking after home/family, long-term sick/disabled, other |
| Economically inactive – long-term sick/disabled | 3.6k | 6.5 | 4.5k | 6 | 135k | 4 | 1.5m | 4 |  |
| Economically inactive – looking after | 2.4k | 4.4 | 2.9k | 3.8 | 133k | 4 | 16.9m | 4.3 |  |
| **Qualifications** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No qualifications | 20.4k | 33 | 23.6k | 27.6 | 914k | 24.7 | 9.7m | 22.4 | All residents aged 16+ |
| **Year last worked** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Residents aged 16-74 |
| 2011 | 546 |  | 841 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 | 1.9k |  | 2.8k |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never worked | 3.8k |  | 5.2k |  |  |  |  |  |  |

