

Household Analysis Review Group (HARG)

Minutes of HARG meeting:

11 June 2014, 10:30am – 12:30pm, Rm 1/G/8, Ladywell House, Edinburgh

Present:

Esther Roughsedge (Chair)	National Records of Scotland (NRS): Household Estimates and Projections (HEP)
Allison Craig	South Ayrshire Council
Alistair Harvey	Edinburgh Council
Aly Barr	Scottish Water
Angela Adams	Glasgow and the Clyde Valley Strategic Development Planning Authority
Blair Melville	Homes for Scotland
Charles Brown	Scottish Government, Centre for Housing Market Analysis (CHMA)
Chris Carr	Argyll & Bute Council (via teleconference)
Duncan Gray	Shelter
Jan Freeke	Glasgow Council
Keith Hoy	Scottish Government, Communities Analytical Services
Paul McNamara	Stirling Council
Steve Morley	North Ayrshire Council
Kirsty MacLachlan	NRS: Demography
Ronan O'Kelly	NRS: Population and Migration Statistics
Darren Knox	NRS: Population and Migration Statistics
Debbie Amabile	NRS: HEP
Hugh Mackenzie	NRS: HEP
Kim Reimann (minutes)	NRS: HEP

Apologies:

Lesley Mann	North Lanarkshire
Maciej Alexander	Clackmannanshire Council
Tony Jenkins	Dundee Council
Lisa Bullen	Scottish Government
Murdo MacPherson	Scottish Government, Communities Analytical Services
Paula Argo	Aberdeenshire Council

1. Welcome and Introductions

- 1.1 Esther welcomed everyone and introductions were made, and minutes of the previous meeting agreed. Paul McNamara pointed out that he did not attend the last meeting, although his name was noted on the attendee list. The minutes for that meeting are now amended.

2. Actions from this meeting

Action 1: Household Estimates and Projections (HEP) branch to proceed with Option 1 – not revising the household estimates data, but explaining very clearly what the changes are and why they have happened.

Action 2: HEP branch to publish the household projections as planned, using the methodology agreed, and to publish unrounded figures instead of figures rounded to the nearest ten.

Action 3: Hugh to investigate the reasons for a slower household growth in East Dunbartonshire, as compared with the previous, 2010-based projections.

Action 4: HEP branch to use Scottish Household Survey (SHS) data for weighting the household projections, as agreed.

Action 5: HEP to consider how the treatment of married quarters in armed forces bases may affect the household figures in areas with armed forces bases, and to note any significant findings in the publication.

Action 6: HEP to incorporate the communal establishment estimates into the 2012-based household projections, as discussed.

3. Minutes of previous meeting, held 4 December, 2013.

- 3.1 **All actions from previous meetings to the December 2013 meeting are now closed.** Section 2.9, Action 6 was covered in today's meeting in the paper on provisional results of the 2012-based Household Projections. Also to note are two forthcoming census reports to be released in August and in the Autumn respectively: one on the topic of households and living arrangements, and a second one on tenure, including changes over the last decade.
- 3.2 **Action 1:** Household Estimates and Projections (HEP) branch to work on producing the 2012-based household projections using the weighted method using three censuses, and to also plan to produce high/low migration variant projections. They will also aim to include analysis of household change between 2001 and 2011 in the household projections publication. **Closed:** covered in this meeting.
- 3.3 **Action 2:** The HEP branch will continue look into possible effects from the change in Council Tax on long-term empty properties, and also liaise with their Scottish Government (SG) contacts on anything that might affect the household estimates data, or help to explain any change over time. **Closed:** covered in this meeting.
- 3.4 **Action 3:** HARG members are invited to comment and give suggestions on any effects of the changes to Council Tax on long-term empty properties. These will be fed through to the quality assurance of the household estimates. **Closed:** HEP Branch have been in contact with councils about this.
- 3.5 **Action 4:** HEP Branch to compare their estimates of individual student halls of residence with the 2011 Census estimates to try to identify reasons differences. **Closed:** covered in this meeting.

4. Review of the Household Estimates

- 4.1 Kim presented three options for the Household Estimates as outlined in [Paper1 HARG 2014\(1\)](#). Following changes to the legislation on the Council Tax chargeable on long-term empty properties, a number of councils have carried out reviews of the properties that were recorded in their Council Tax systems as being long-term empty or second homes, and this has led to changes in these figures between 2012 and 2013. In the paper, we described what the data show, and we considered possible revisions to the figures for 2012 and previous years, as a result. Our preferred option (Option 1) would be not to revise the previous years, but to explain very clearly what has happened, and what the effects are on our figures. The group agreed with this.
- 4.2 Paul stated that it would be useful to point out the differences occurring in the data on any graphs themselves, in addition to the added explanatory comments.
- 4.3 Angela recommended that it would be useful to include a note of exactly which councils had made reviews to their categorisations of properties, so that users could be better informed about the changes.
- 4.4 Jan mentioned that it was important to explain the context of the changes – for example, what is happening in the house building market and how the apparent increases in households are ‘not’ due to rises in new house builds.
- 4.5 Blair enquired what the effect of these changes might be on the household projections. Esther explained that any changes will be minor and not affect the shape of the projections.
- 4.6 Duncan remarked that it would be useful for users if Household Estimates and Projections (HEP) branch explain as much as possible in the text of the publication. This could include highlighting the changes themselves, and the reasons for the changes. This would be in order to prevent accidental misunderstanding of the statistics, by spelling out the limitations and details of the data.

Action 1: HEP branch to proceed with Option 1 – not revising the household estimates data, but explaining very clearly what the changes are and why they have happened.

5. Provisional 2012-based Household Projection Results

- 5.1 Hugh presented [Paper 2 HARG paper 2014\(2\)](#). This paper describes the draft 2012-based household projections, due to be published by National Records of Scotland (NRS) in July. It discusses the methodology used and results obtained, as well as looking at differences from the 2010-based household projections. Hugh described how there were relatively large differences between these projections and the last 2010-based projections. However the differences are not unexpected given the inclusion of 2011 Census results, the resultant changes to the method used in the projections and differences between the 2010 and 2012-based population projections. This suggests that there is no need for further changes to the methodology used to produce these projections.
- 5.2 There are two main factors for the projected number of households generally being lower. Firstly, the trends in household formation have changed since 2001, and this is now reflected in the projections after the introduction of 2011 Census headship rates in the methodology. The fall in average household size between 2001 and

2011 was not as great as had been projected based on trends seen between 1991 and 2001. Secondly, the 2012-based population projections for some councils are quite different from the 2010-based population projections.

- 5.3 Alistair raised concerns about the projections for Edinburgh, and said that the actual change as seen in the household estimates has always been lower than that shown in the household projections. He mentioned that the 2011 Census showed that net migration figures for Edinburgh were lower than projected and could be a contributing factor to this. He thought there were discrepancies with the average household size figures as well. Esther noted that the projections to be published would include high and low variants of migration. Jan noted that the population projections have a lot to do with the reasons for the differences. He also commented on the fact that the migration assumptions are based on the last five years' data, but the household change information is from the last 20 years, which could perhaps lead to discrepancies. Esther noted this, but also noted that migration figures are likely to change more rapidly than household formation rates, so it can make sense to use data from different time periods. Kirsty noted that in terms of household formation, the biggest changes have been among young adults, and these are the group of people who are hardest to count. Darren said that his population projections team were aware of these issues and were looking into reviewing their migration methods this summer. Jan mentioned that the effect of the economic downturn could also have affected migration patterns between cities and their conurbations and suggested that this be looked into further. Blair noted that the projections for the SESPlan housing market area should be OK, even if there are issues with an individual council's figures.
- 5.4 Esther stated the new set of projections to be published will be lower than those of the last set of 2010-based projections, but higher than the last few years' estimates have shown. This is because its projections incorporate three censuses, and should reflect longer-term trends better.
- 5.5 Household Estimates and Projections (HEP) are planning to include some analysis of the differences between the 2010 and 2012-based household projections in the upcoming publication itself. National Records of Scotland (NRS) is also planning to publish a paper looking at changes in the figures on households and living arrangements between the 2001 and 2011 Censuses.
- 5.6 In the past, HEP have rounded household projections figures to the nearest ten, in an effort to emphasise that these projections cannot be precise. However, to make it easier for users to use the data (particularly with respect to being able to add up figures), HEP propose to publish unrounded figures for the 2012-based household projections. This was agreed as a useful improvement to the upcoming publication.

Action 2: HEP branch to publish the household projections as planned, using the methodology agreed, and to publish unrounded figures instead of figures rounded to the nearest ten.

- 5.7 Jan noted that for East Dunbartonshire the lower rate of projected population loss (as compared with the 2010-based projections, refer to Figure 6) had not resulted in a higher household projection (as compared with the 2010-based projections, refer to Figure 5). In fact the new household projections are considerably lower than the previous projections. The slowdown in household formation would account for some

of the reduction in projected household growth. But the size of the reduction seems large when it is considered against a more positive population projection. He was looking for an explanation. Hugh offered to look further into why this might be the case.

Action 3: Hugh to investigate the reasons for a slower household growth in East Dunbartonshire, as compared with the previous, 2010-based projections.

6. 2012-based Household Projections Methodology - Choosing Survey Data

- 6.1 Debbie then gave a presentation based on her paper [Paper3 HARG 2014\(3\)](#) - 2012-based Household Projections Methodology - Choosing Survey Data. Debbie described how she had investigated the three main Scottish Government (SG) population surveys (the Scottish Household Survey (SHS), Scottish Health Survey (SHeS) and Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS)), which are combined into the SG's pooled dataset, and Office for National Statistic's (ONS) Annual Population Surveys (APS), and concluded that we should use the SHS for weighting the household projections results. The SHS was chosen based on its sampling design, definition of households, ease of access to the data needed, and the fact that the weighting method does not make use of our household projections (to avoid 'circularity').
- 6.2 The SHS was originally used in testing as it was specifically designed to provide information on (amongst other things) the composition of households in Scotland and it has a reasonably large sample size. In an attempt to account for biases in SHS data, an adjustment is made based on the difference between household type information in the 2011 Census and the 2011 SHS. We have SHS data for 2012, we can adjust it (using census household type information) to account for any biases towards particular household types and the survey methodology is well documented and relatively simple to understand.
- 6.3 The group agreed with the continued use of the SHS as the 2012-based household projections, based on Debbie's 'clear and concise' effort to convey the rationale of why this remains the chosen data source. Duncan noted that we should say in the household projections publication that one of the reasons for using survey data in this way is that it provides continuing flexibility to reflect changes in household structure between census years.

Action 4: HEP branch to use SHS data for weighting the household projections, as agreed.

7. 2012-based Communal Establishment Estimates

- 7.1 Hugh presented the paper [Paper 4 HARG 2014\(4\)](#) - 2012-based Communal Establishment Estimates. This paper describes the sources of the 2012-based Communal Establishment (CE) estimates, revisions to the methodology since the 2010-based estimates regarding adult care, and summarises the draft 2012-based communal establishment estimates. Hugh added that he had already consulted with PAMS members on the individual Council area figures. Hugh noted that the CE figures are generally higher than previous 2010-based estimates.
- 7.2 The group noted that East Dunbartonshire's CE estimates increased significantly. East Dunbartonshire has a relatively high proportion of CE residents. So, when the CE population is removed from the total population to obtain the population in households, then there is a downward effect on the household projections.

- 7.3 Chris noted that much of the difference in Argyll & Bute's figures is likely to be due to the armed forces base there. She noted that the armed forces base has married quarters accommodation as well as barracks, and the differences in the way they are treated will affect the household numbers.

Action 5: HEP to consider how the treatment of married quarters in armed forces bases may affect the household figures in areas with armed forces bases, and to note any significant findings in the publication.

- 7.4 The change to the method proposed for estimating the population in adult care homes was for the imputation of long stay residents recorded in the Information Services Directorate (ISD) Care Home Census without information on their gender or age. This change does not affect the total number of people estimated to be in adult care homes but does increase the numbers of residents in the oldest age groups.

- 7.5 The group agreed with the proposed changes to the methodology regarding adult care, and so the communal establishment estimates will be revised and incorporated into the 2012-based household projections.

Action 6: HEP to incorporate the communal establishment estimates into the 2012-based household projections, as discussed.

8. Any other business

- 8.1 No other business was discussed, and HARG members were thanked for their contributions to improving the HEP statistics. It was noted again that the figures discussed today cannot be used or passed on to anyone else until after publication on 30 July 2014.

9. Date of Next Meeting

- 9.1 The next meeting will be held in Spring 2015. To note, household estimates and projections will both be published on 30 July, 2014.