

HOUSEHOLD ANALYSES REVIEW GROUP:

Minutes for the meeting of April 17th 2003
Conference room 6, Victoria Quay, 1.30-4.30 pm

Present:

Duncan Gray (Chairman)	Scottish Executive Development Department Analytical Services Division
Elizabeth Fraser	Scottish Executive Development Department Analytical Services Division
Stephen Fraser	North Ayrshire Council (also representing SCAG)
Jan Freeke	Glasgow City Council
Karren Friel	Communities Scotland Scottish House Condition Survey Team
Alistair Harvey	City of Edinburgh Council
Cecilia Macintyre	Scottish Executive Development Department Analytical Services Division
Frank Thomas	General Register Office for Scotland
Katie Walker	Scottish Executive Development Department Analytical Services Division
Helen Wood	Scottish Executive Development Department Planning Services Division

Apologies:

Craig McCorrison	West Lothian Council
Derek Neill	North Lanarkshire Council
Tom Snowling	Aberdeen City Council

**AGENDA ITEMS 1 AND 2: INTRODUCTIONS, APOLOGIES,
MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING**

1.1 The Chairman welcomed members of the group to the meeting and went through the apologies. There had been a lot of changes in the staff in the Executive's housing statistics branch since the last meeting therefore the group introduced themselves.

1.2 From the minutes of the last meeting there were two matters arising. There would be an update of neighbourhood statistics developments later in the meeting instead of a note circulated.

1.3 **Elizabeth Fraser would check whether a bid had been put to GROS for data required to produce 2001 headship rates and for the data required to re-produce 1991 headship rates with students counted at their term time address. Frank Thomas would check whether it was possible to reproduce the 1991 data. [Action: Elizabeth Fraser and Frank Thomas]**

AGENDA ITEM 3: IDENTIFYING USERS NEEDS

2.1 Katie Walker summarised a paper on the results from the non-local authority users survey and Stephen Fraser summarised a paper on the key points from all consultations. Overall the feedback had been positive but with more interest in the household estimates than in the projections. Users were interested in estimates split by tenure and household type and at lower geography levels. Users, in particular local authorities, were interested in extending the time period for projections to the 16 years that GROS use.

2.2 There was interest in which household types categories should be used. Some had suggested the Census categories but the Census had two types of categories, one based on numbers of people and one based on relationships of people. There was particular interest in the definition of single parent households.

2.3 It was decided to feed the consultation feedback into the programme of work for household estimates and projections. It was suggested that once a programme or plan had been written it should be circulated for comments to those who responded and those with an interest registered on the SCOTSTAT register. Cecilia Macintyre suggested that this could involve a presentation or a seminar, as that would get more response to the plan.

2.4 **A programme of work for the estimates and projections should be drafted and circulated. [Action: Scottish Executive]**

AGENDA ITEM 5: HOUSEHOLD PROJECTIONS (HARG 2003/3)

3.1 This agenda item was moved up the agenda. Jan Freeke summarised the paper. It described what had happened in the previous review of the projection methodology in 1993 and how this could be applied to a review carried out now. Prior to 1993 the Scottish projections were produced using marital status similar to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) method for England. In 1993 it had been decided to stop using marital status because between the 1981 and 1991 Censuses society had changed by increasing cohabiting and the number of females who were heads of households so problems with the headship rates had developed.

3.2 Duncan Gray showed a graph which plotted the average household size for each local authority from the projection data and the 2001 Census data. At Scotland level the difference

was only 0.02 but at local authority level the differences could be as large as 0.12 in Aberdeen city or as small as 0.00 in Angus.

3.3 It was suggested that it would be useful to include a note on how reliable the projections were in the publication. The note could pick out the sources of errors, whether it was from the headship rates or the population projections or from scaling the projections to match the household estimates. This could use the sensitivity analyses from the population projections by GROS.

3.4 From the consultations it was shown that users did not want to lose data while development was taking place, therefore it was decided to produce 2002 based projections using the old method while also commissioning research to look into the methodology.

3.5 The 2002 based population projections were due to be published in October or November 2003, earlier than usual. **Therefore the production of the household projections should be moved earlier to January 2004 depending on resources. [Action: Scottish Executive]** It was noted that the 2002 midyear household estimates would not be available in January for the projections to scale to. The housing statistics branch will produce provisional estimates for the projections as most of the data would be available or could be estimated.

3.6 The research work commissioned should look at the various data sources available and at the methodology. **Elizabeth Fraser said that members of ODPM were interested in our methodology and the review of it and should be invited to our next meeting. Janet Hayden from Anglia Polytechnic who actually produce the ODPM projections should also be invited. [Action: Scottish Executive]** The research work could take up to 18 months. **The statistics branch would produce a draft specification and circulate it round the group and ODPM. [Action: Scottish Executive]** It was suggested that it would be useful to have a meeting solely on projections and the research possibly in summer or early autumn.

3.7 Jan Freeke asked if he would be able to have projected headship rates from the current methodology sooner than the outputs.

AGENDA ITEM 4: DWELLING STOCK AND HOUSEHOLD ESTIMATES **(HARG 2003/1, HARG 2003/2)**

4.1 Cecilia Macintyre summarised the paper HARG 2003/1. She suggested using networks to gain some of the explanations for the differences between estimates and the Census at local authority areas. **The paper was to be tidied up and then circulated to local authorities. [Action: Cecilia Macintyre, Katie Walker and Stephen Fraser]**

4.2 It was decided to keep producing the stock based estimates but update the various constituents from the 2001 Census data. There were large differences between the sharing allowance in the methodology and the sharing data from the Census and this would need investigated. The vacancy data would be available after the vacant follow up survey report was released in autumn. This would then be used in the production of the estimates.

4.3 It was decided to also investigate the possibilities of population based estimates similar to the approach used by ODPM. **A paper should be produced for the next meeting with initial suggestions. [Action: Scottish Executive]**

4.4 It was suggested that the council tax data could be used to produce provisional estimates, as they were available earlier than the estimates.

4.5 Frank Thomas summarised some of the definitions of dwellings and households used in the Census. **He will provide a short note on this, which will be circulated round the group. [Action: Circulated with minutes]**

4.6 Elizabeth Fraser gave a progress report on the post-Census vacant follow up survey. It is hoped to have final tables by July. **The table specifications and supporting information will be circulated again. [Action: Elizabeth Fraser] Frank hoped to be able to have some figures available in June to give an idea of numbers and weighting. [Action: Frank Thomas]** This would help local authorities that had not paid for a boost know what data would be available to them.

4.7 Frank also introduced a table which had been produced for PAMS showing the number of households with residents by tenure and landlord. This showed that about 42,000 households had said that they lived rent-free when their landlord was the council, local authority or Scottish Homes. These could be those receiving housing benefit.

4.8 Duncan Gray summarised the paper HARG 2003/2. **Cecilia Macintyre would compare ward based dwellings from the Census and Council tax and would circulate to GROS and local authorities to get some explanations for the differences. [Action: Cecilia Macintyre]** This would assist in the review of whether to use council data.

4.9 The other alternative would be to produce population based estimates. GROS were producing small area population estimates for ward and postcode sectors but it could be at a lower level for internal use. **Duncan Gray would speak to Garnett Compton at GROS about this possibility. [Action: Duncan Gray]**

4.10 **The paper would be put to the Neighbourhood statistics group as well. [Action: Cecilia Macintyre]**

AGENDA ITEM 6: ESTIMATES OF INSTITUTIONAL POPULATION (HARG 2002/4)

5.1 Duncan Gray summarised the paper. GROS were already working on this and **it was suggested that a copy of the paper be sent to Garnett Compton [Action: Scottish Executive]** who could pass it onto Simon Coote and Tricia Couper who were working on it. The group would wait for the next meeting for a response from GROS before setting up a small subgroup to take the work forward. **Any suggestions for membership of this small subgroup and comments on the paper would be welcome. [Action: all]**

AGENDA ITEM 7: DEVELOPMENT PLAN: TIMETABLE OF WORK FOR HARG

6.2 A draft development plan had already been produced through the meeting's discussions and it was decided to leave a timetable until the next meeting.

It was hoped that the next meeting would be at the end of June.

The Chairman drew the meeting to a close.