

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 note, we have had limited resources available to look at this and have the following response which is by no means comprehensive.

2011 OUTPUT AREA changes

1. Move Output Area S0126993 from DZ240180 to DZ240181 - Pitlochry
2. Move OA S0126198 from DZ240027 to DZ240036 - Oudenarde/Bridge of Earn

See attached maps for both of these. The red cross marks the OA in question.

Other comments

1. We have a general concern over data zones splitting a number of our settlements. This has been the case since 2001 and poses us difficulties but we understand that this can happen because of the geographic nature of our area and would have a problematic knock-on effect if we attempted to make changes in most instances.
2. We also have some issues that are caused by the Output Area boundaries. A prime example of this is DZ240135 at Luncarty. The Output Area S00127367 crosses the River Tay and therefore joins Luncarty with Stormontfield which is an extremely inappropriate boundary. The River Tay is a wide river and the 2 communities are very separate. I have mentioned this OA anomaly before to the GRO when it first occurred in 2001 but it has remained the same in 2011.
3. We notice that data zone S01005071 has been removed and is now joined with DZ240110 (North Muirton in Perth). This is a regeneration area where buildings have been demolished and there is a programme to rebuild in place ready to go ahead. Therefore the data zone will probably be split again in the future. We wonder if this is the best way to handle this sort of situation? Our preference would have been to keep the area split in 2 for comparison purposes, specifically for other data

provided at data zone level over time as the community regenerates.

4. There have been some improvements made to some of the data zones in the areas that do not cover settlements. These can now be a better fit to some of our higher geographies but in some instances this can be at the expense of the settlement split. An example of this is the area between Alyth and Coupar Angus. Whilst the area between the two is now better, we have lost some of our comparability for Alyth though the Coupar Angus area is an improved boundary.

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

Comments

**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.

Comments