

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

Are you content with the proposed 2011 Data Zones?

Yes No

If you wish to make suggestions for change to a small number of draft Data Zones please provide the Data Zone code together with an explanation of its design limitations and the statistical benefits that would result from altering its boundary. Any accompanying maps and future supporting details would also be useful; preferably, a list of Census Output Areas with their current draft Data Zone assignment, along with the proposed new Data Zone assignment should be included.

Please also see appendix 1 and note that the Council has identified two additional zones to be split where the 2011 population is close to the maximum figure, development is ongoing, and the population will soon rise above 1,150.

When responding to this consultation we note that our understanding, based upon advice received from Government officials, is that the principle for change to data zones is to be based upon:

- Population change – growth or decline
- Changes in postcode zones or census output areas

Our comments to a number of the proposed changes are set out at Appendix 1. The overarching concern relates to the limitation placed on us by the pre-determined output areas. This has considerably restricted our ability to make data zones more meaningful in terms of communities. Good examples of this are:

- S00117745 crosses the A9 with the result that it is not a natural community.
- The single output area S00118267 covers a large, mainly industrial and commercial area which straddles the A9. Its size and shape has made it impossible for us to improve the proposed split of the former city centre zone S01003853.

Whilst we recognise that datazones are a statistical geography, there is a need to be aware that they are being used increasingly beyond this. For statistical purposes, data zones are being used to monitor more than just population, for example employment (through the Business Register and Employment Survey). They are also being assumed as representative of natural communities for the allocation of targeted funding by a number of Agencies and organisations. We would therefore recommend that the Government take cognisance of this in the future and attempt to harmonise data zones with administrative geographies where possible.

As set out in appendix one, we reluctantly agree with a number of the proposed changes as we recognise that there is little alternative given the underpinning geography. However we would urge the Government that in the future,

consultation on output areas would assist in achieving more useful and meaningful data zone geographies.

Do you agree that 2011 Data Zones should use the median methodology for the calculation of centroids?

Please see page 17 for further information.

Yes No

The Council agrees that the use of medians (rather than the mean) has the potential to give a better location for the centroid, but believes that a more accurate method is available than basing the Data Zone centroid on the centroid of the output areas that make it up.

The One Scotland Gazetteer gives an accurate location for almost all residential properties in Scotland and it should be possible to use the X and Y co-ordinates from the Gazetteer to calculate the medians for all of the houses that lie within each datazone, and then snap this to the nearest house. This would give the most accurate position for the centroid and ensure that it falls within the boundary of the zone. In the event that the Gazetteer is not available, the former OS Address Point or current Address Base data sets could be used.

Are you content with the proposed best fit 2011 Intermediate Zones? If changes occur to the proposed 2011 Data Zones post consultation, these changes will be reflected in the Intermediate Zones.

Yes No

If you wish to make suggestions for change to a small number of best fit Intermediate Zones; please provide the Intermediate Zone code together with an explanation of its design limitations and the statistical benefits that would result from altering its boundary. Any accompanying maps and future supporting details would also be useful; preferably, a list of Draft 2011 Data Zones with their current draft 2001 Intermediate Zone assignment, along with the proposed new Intermediate Zone assignment should be included.

The Council agrees with the proposals for best fit 2011 Intermediate Zones.

**Scottish Government Redraw of Data Zones Consultation
Additional Information from The Highland Council**

Existing 2001 Zone	Proposed 2011 Zones	Comment
S01003755	DZ170037 DZ170038	Agreed
S01003778	DZ170061 DZ170062 DZ170063 DZ170064	Agreed but note that the single complex output area S00119078 has limited our ability to make sensible proposals that align the proposed data zones to existing communities and proposed development in this major expansion area to the City of Inverness
S01003781	DZ170067 DZ170068	Agreed
S01003783	DZ170070 DZ170071	Agreed – the population of S001170071 is marginal but the area includes significant areas allocated for new housing where construction is already underway, and the current 2014 population will be well over 500.
S01003784	DZ170072 DZ170073	<p>Disagree. The proposed new zones are compromised by the large rural output area S00117745 which extends north eastwards from the major growth areas of Inshes and Milton of Leys, across the A9, and into the fringes of Culloden. It has been allocated to DZ170082 - which has a current population of 940 – but contains major development sites west of the A9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parks Farm where construction has started and the site capacity is around 300; • The proposed Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan site H40 which is a longer term site with a capacity of several hundred houses. <p>This output area should be moved into DZ170073 where it will achieve a better population balance and reflect future growth west of the A9.</p> <p>Output area S00119088 should be allocated to its natural community and be assigned to DZ170072 (rather than DZ170061 as proposed).</p>
S01003792	DZ170081 DZ170082 DZ170083	Agreed but with the proviso that S00117745 should be removed from the proposed DZ170082 and put into DZ170073 – see above.
S01003805	DZ170096 DZ170097	Agreed
S01003819	DZ170111 DZ170112 DZ170113	Agreed
S01003853	DZ170147 DZ170148	Agreed
S01003867	DZ170162	Agreed

	DZ170163	
S01003888	DZ170184 DZ170185	Agreed
S01003905	DZ170202 DZ170203	Agreed
S01003931	DZ170229 DZ170230	Agreed. This proposal is particularly welcome as it splits the two natural communities of Milnafua (proposed DZ170230) and Obsdale (proposed DZ170229). The 2011 population of DZ170229 is marginal but is on the fringe of a growth area and should see a slight population increase.
S01003995	DZ170294 DZ170295	Agreed

ZONES IDENTIFIED BY THE COUNCIL AS ADDITIONAL CANDIDATES TO BE SPLIT

Proposed 2011 Zones	2011 Output Areas	Comment
DZ170060 #1	S00117811 S00117812 S00117813 S00117814 S00117816 2011 population 639	This zone covers a large rural area plus the dispersed rural settlement of Kiltarlity which contains three new housing sites. Two of these have seen the start of construction since the 2011 Census and all three are expected to be completed within the next 5 to 10 years. The proposed split puts the housing sites in the smaller fragment where we would expect the current 2014 population to be above 500.
DZ170060 #2	S00117817 S00117818 S00119292 S00119293 2011 population 475	
DZ170122 #1	S00117780 S00117781 S00117782 S00119499 2011 population 496	This zone covers a major expansion area to the east of Inverness which includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an active housing site with a capacity of 65 houses plus a smaller site where a planning application for 11 houses is under consideration; • the Stratton development which has planning permission for 1,900 houses (a long term development which is not expected to start in the near future); and • The new UHI campus which may include student accommodation in the medium to long term. The proposed split puts the new development in the smaller fragment.
DZ170122 #2	S00117761 S00118554 S00118555 S00118556 S00118557 S00118559 2011 population 649	