

**Fulfilling Lives: Ageing Better**  
**How were the top 100 areas identified?**

Criteria used to identify dataset and sources used:  
 September 2011

Category	Sub-category	Indicator	Source
	<b>Main criteria</b>	Population aged 60+	Census 2001
<b>Age- and isolation-specific</b>	<b>Personal circumstances</b>	One person pensioner households	Census 2001
		Population aged 60+ who are single and never married	Census 2001
		Population aged 60+ who are separated	Census 2001
		Population aged 60+ who are divorced	Census 2001
		Population aged 60+ who are widowed	Census 2001
	<b>Transitions</b>	Population aged 60+ who provide care for 50+ hours per week	Census 2001
	<b>Health and disability</b>	60-74 year olds who are economically inactive and permanently sick/disabled	Census 2001
	<b>Housing deprivation</b>	One person pensioner households with sole use of bath/shower, and without central heating	Census 2001
		People aged 60+ with no central heating in an unshared dwelling	Census 2001
	<b>Transport deprivation</b>	One person pensioner households with no cars	Census 2001
<b>Income deprivation</b>	Income Deprivation Affecting Older People Index (IDAOPI)	IMD (2010)	
<b>Isolation-specific</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	Households within a short distance of a Supermarket (inverted)	Rural Services Survey (2008)
		Households within a short distance of a Principal GP Surgery (inverted)	Rural Services Survey (2008)
	<b>Social cohesion</b>	People who feel they belong to their immediate neighbourhood (inverted)	Place- Based Survey 2008 (now discontinued)

**Summary of methodology for area selection**

In order to determine a targeted approach to this investment, BIG commissioned Local Futures to determine Local Authority areas that had the highest levels of older people at risk of living in isolation. No one data set was available to determine this targeting and Local Futures created a methodology that assessed the levels of isolation across England, using key predictors of isolation. BIG's own

thinking and feedback from stakeholders identified that the analysis should be focused on boroughs, districts and unitary authorities, instead of upper tier areas.

### **Identifying areas where ageing would be a more pressing issue**

The methodology prioritises areas by proportion (percentage of the local population aged over 60) as opposed to by scale (absolute numbers of over 60). A scale approach was rejected as it naturally favoured larger authority areas, whereas the intention is to identify areas where there are relatively more older residents. All areas were ranked on this basis.

### **Identifying areas where isolation might be more prevalent**

By highlighting a number of key predictors of isolation - being single (widowed, divorced, etc), poor health, having a low income or being a carer - Local Futures identified a corresponding basket of statistical indicators linked to these characteristics amongst the over 60's. They also included two generic indicators which were specific to isolation, based on access to services and social belonging. All areas were ranked against all of these and a cumulative ranking was reached.

Final area selection was based on a ranking system which orders districts (which from now on is taken to include boroughs and unitaries) according to their performance on the key risk predictors of isolation and the proportion of older people living the area. All risk factors were given an equal weighting.