Appendix A-Community Lottery -Lottery Analysis (Aug-19 vs Nov-17)

This report compares players and causes from November 2017 and August 2019.

Acorn Category	Aug-19		Nov-17	
	Number	%	Number	%
1 Affluent Achievers	759	48.6%	749	47.7%
2 Rising Prosperity	149	9.5%	154	9.8%
3 Comfortable Communities	375	24.0%	366	23.3%
4 Financially Stretched	214	13.7%	227	14.5%
5 Urban Adversity	44	2.8%	56	3.6%
6 Not Private Households	9	0.6%	10	0.6%
Category not available	12	0.8%	8	0.5%
Total	1562	100%	1570	100%

The table above shows that the number of players has remained fairly static in the last 21 months. There has been a very minimal change in the category of people playing with 25 less people in the least affluent groups and an increase of 14 in the most affluent.

The majority of players (82%) come from the three most affluent categories, with only 17% coming from the least affluent. Almost half of players (48.6%) are from the most affluent category.

Acorn Group	Aug-19		Nov-17	
	Number	%	Number	%
A Lavish Lifestyles	10	0.6%	15	1.0%
B Executive Wealth	445	28.5%	438	27.9%
C Mature Money	304	19.5%	296	18.9%
D City Sophisticates	5	0.3%	2	0.1%
E Career Climbers	144	9.2%	152	9.7%
F Countryside Communities	49	3.1%	43	2.7%
G Successful Suburbs	107	6.9%	103	6.6%
H Steady Neighbourhoods	120	7.7%	118	7.5%
I Comfortable Seniors	9	0.6%	10	0.6%
J Starting Out	90	5.8%	92	5.9%
K Student Life	5	0.3%	3	0.2%
L Modest Means	35	2.2%	39	2.5%
M Striving Families	158	10.1%	165	10.5%
N Poorer Pensioners	16	1.0%	20	1.3%
O Young Hardship	17	1.1%	23	1.5%
P Struggling Estates	16	1.0%	18	1.1%
Q Difficult Circumstances	11	0.7%	15	1.0%
R Not Private Households	9	0.6%	10	0.6%
Group not available	12	0.8%	8	0.5%
Total	1562	100%	1570	100%

The table above shows that the largest percentage of players (28.5%) are in the Executive Wealth group, a slight increase of 7 players compared to 2017. The top five groups are also the same as in 2017: Executive Wealth, Mature Money, Striving Families, Career Climbers and Steady Neighbourhoods. The top five consists of four of the most affluent groups and one of the least affluent groups.

Ward	Aug-19		Nov-17	
	Number	%	Number	%
Aston Clinton & Stoke Mandeville	71	4.5%	83	5.3%
Bedgrove	72	4.6%	64	4.1%
Buckingham North	33	2.1%	27	1.7%
Buckingham South	30	1.9%	15	1.0%
Central & Walton	41	2.6%	52	3.3%
Coldharbour	52	3.3%	67	4.3%
Edlesborough	4	0.3%	2	0.1%
Elmhurst	33	2.1%	39	2.5%
Gatehouse	51	3.3%	55	3.5%
Great Brickhill & Newton Longville	58	3.7%	71	4.5%
Great Horwood	39	2.5%	32	2.0%
Grendon Underwood & Brill	46	2.9%	57	3.6%
Haddenham & Stone	93	6.0%	106	6.8%
Long Crendon	17	1.1%	22	1.4%
Luffield Abbey	23	1.5%	28	1.8%
Mandeville & Elm Farm	93	6.0%	92	5.9%
Marsh Gibbon	9	0.6%	10	0.6%
Oakfield & Bierton	59	3.8%	69	4.4%
Oakley	29	1.9%	27	1.7%
Pitstone and Cheddington	32	2.0%	29	1.8%
Quainton	26	1.7%	32	2.0%
Riverside	64	4.1%	48	3.1%
Southcourt	21	1.3%	20	1.3%
Steeple Claydon	15	1.0%	16	1.0%
Stewkley	32	2.0%	38	2.4%
Tingewick	29	1.9%	7	0.4%
Waddesdon	32	2.0%	28	1.8%
Walton Court & Hawkslade	31	2.0%	34	2.2%
Watermead	35	2.2%	41	2.6%
Wendover & Halton	69	4.4%	47	3.0%
Wing	16	1.0%	16	1.0%
Wingrave	24	1.5%	28	1.8%
Winslow	59	3.8%	57	3.6%
Out of District	222	14.2%	208	13.2%
Ward not available	2	0.1%	3	0.2%
Total	1562	1	1570	1

There are player in every ward in the district and the table above shows the distribution of these players. There are 222 (14%) of players from outside the district, this has increased slightly from 2017 when there were 208 (13%).

The top 5 wards with the most number of players are Haddenham & Stone (93), Mandeville & Elm Farm (93), Bedgrove (72), Aston Clinton & Stoke Mandeville (71) and Wendover & Halton (69). Bedgrove and Wendover & Halton are new additions to the top 5 replacing Great Brickhill & Newton Longville and Oakfield & Bierton.

The wards with the least number of players are Edlesborough (4), Marsh Gibbon (9), Steeple Claydon (15), Wing (16) and Long Crendon (17). Long Crendon is a new Addition to the bottom 5 replacing Buckingham South and Tingewick. *(N.B. In 2017 there was a bottom 6 as Wing and Steeple Claydon both had 16)*

	Aug-19		Nov-17	
Age	Number	%	Number	%
10-19	0	0.0%	1	0.1%
20-29	42	2.7%	39	2.5%
30-39	210	13.4%	239	15.2%
40-49	402	25.7%	388	24.7%
50-59	368	23.6%	365	23.2%
60-69	265	17.0%	290	18.5%
70-79	211	13.5%	202	12.9%
80-89	49	3.1%	33	2.1%
90-99	2	0.1%	4	0.3%
100-110	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
110-120	1	0.1%	1	0.1%
Age Not Available	12	0.8%	8	0.5%
Total	1562	1	1570	1