

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.

I have one suggestion for improvement (see comment about intermediate geographies); we are limited in re-drawing datazone boundaries by the census output areas already set. I think that more improvements could be made to datazone areas but in identified cases changes have not been possible due to the census output areas.

Please note that with no GIS software I found it difficult to comment on this consultation; it was difficult to understand the proposed datazones – especially where boundaries were drawn around islands – an ability to shade a datazone would have helped with this.

Colonsay is currently part of datazone S1000755 which also includes Jura and part of Islay (DZ350045). These islands form their own distinct communities and it makes little sense to group them together (other than that the population of Colonsay and Jura are too low to form datazones independently). Although Islay and Jura are often served by the same NHS teams, Colonsay is primarily accessed from Oban and is served by NHS teams administrated from Oban. Therefore it would be preferable to include Colonsay in a datazone with Coll and Tiree, Easdale or Kerrera. However all these alternatives are also 'unnatural'. I have discussed this with a colleague at Argyll and Bute Council and although the Council also serves Colonsay from Oban they are reluctant to recommend that Colonsay is included in a datazone close to Oban; this is because politically Colonsay is included in a multimember ward with Islay and Jura and because there isn't a clear alternative as to where to place Colonsay.

It would be helpful to be able to separate the military from non-military populations in Argyll and Bute. DZ350090 (Garelochhead) will help to separate the settlement population of Garelochhead from the communal establishment population at the Faslane barracks.

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

This seems to be sensible. I have not examined in detail how this change will affect datazone allocation to other geographies in practice but it appears that there will be little change for Argyll and Bute.

**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.

Intermediate geographies are important to the NHS in Argyll and Bute because of the production of ScotPho health and wellbeing profiles using them.

The Whiskey Isles Intermediate Geography (134) makes little sense as Islay and Jura are administered from Kintyre. Colonsay and Easdale are administered from Oban. I think that Islay and Jura are of sufficient size that they could form their own intermediate geography (with Colonsay if necessary).

It also makes little sense that datazones in Tarbert and surroundings (725, 738 and 739) are not included in Kintyre trail as these three geographies are functionally part of the greater area of Mid-Argyll (including Lochgilphead and Ardrishaig) and not considered part of Kintyre. Would these three areas, possibly along with Knapdale (736) form enough population to make an Intermediate geography?

I believe that Inverary (DZ350099) should become part of the Mid-Argyll IG (145; S02000145). Inverary is part of the wider area of Mid-Argyll for both the NHS and the Council in Argyll and Bute.

The Loch Awe IG (147) might then include Easdale (DZ350098). This would be necessary if Easdale is no longer to be included in Whiskey Isles (IG134).

However, it makes little sense to include Easdale and Taynuilt in the same IG. It might be possible to split DZ1000808 (3500100) so that part of it can be with DZ350112 (SOAs 94083, 94082, 84081). It might be necessary to place SOA94078 with the rest of DZ 350100. I'm not sure that this is feasible in terms of population sizes. I think to get suitable population sizes, boundaries around Benderloch Trail and Loch Awe will need changing but I'm struggling to give details readily based on the information that I can access. It might be that it makes sense to propose another IG including Easdale and areas south of Oban including DZ350102.