

ANNIESLAND, JORDANHILL & WHITEINCH NEIGHBOURHOOD

1 POPULATION PROFILE 3-YEAR CHANGE

(Sources: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles and 2014 Population Estimates by Neighbourhood)

2011 CENSUS	Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency	1,936	6,675	1,506	10,117
	N/Hood %	19.13	65.98	14.88	
	cf city %	16.12	70.03	13.85	

2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES	Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency	1,973	6,777	1,554	10,304
	N/Hood %	19.14	65.77	15.08	
	cf city %	16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

Commentary

Total population **increase** of 187 (+1.81%)
 Consistently higher child population than average
 Rising proportion of over 65s

Housing policy implications

Suggests requirement for an increase the supply of larger family dwellings
 Suggests requirement for expansion of provision of housing for over 65s

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood	4,734	
A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	537	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.30%	
Proportion of all households	11.34%	14.46%
B LONE PARENT H/HOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	348	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.31%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	64.80%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%
C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,312	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.00%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children in Neighbourhood	27.71%	22.96%
D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	971	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	20.51%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	2.00%	16.96%

Single person households over 65

% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood
 % of households single person over 65 as a proportion
 of all households

737	36,508
2.02%	
15.57%	12.78%

(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbourhood)

E ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65

ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65
 Proportion of one person HH under 65 as a proportion
 of all households

N/hood	City
1255	86,728
26.51%	30.35%

(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbourhood)

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

N/hood has lower than average proportion of lone
A parent households

Proportion of lone parent households with dependent

B children is no higher than the rest of the city

N/hood has higher proportion of households with
C dependent children compared to city average

N/hood contains higher proportion of all-over 65

D households than city average and single over 65s

Lower than city average proportion of one person

E households under 65

Housing policy implications

Housing providers should consider increasing supply of
 housing for older people and younger family
 households

3 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD SIZE

(Specific Source: Census Table QS406SC Household Size by Neighbourhood)

		N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	1,992	42.07%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	1,248	26.36%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	656	13.85%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	589	12.44%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people or more	208	4.39%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	35	0.74%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	4	0.08%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	2	0.04%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	4,734		

Commentary

One and two person households lower than city average - May be accounted for by dwelling type, size and tenure. Higher proportion of larger family dwellings in current stock

Housing policy implications

None

4 HOUSING TENURE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

NEIGHBOURHOOD	Owner Occupied	Private Rented	Social Rented	Shared ownership	Rent free	Total
TENURE COMPARISON (2014)	2,770	744	1373			4,887
	56.68%	15.22%	28.09%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	2,771	520	1392	13	38	4,734
	58.53%	10.98%	29.40%			
CITY TENURE COMPARISON (2014)	128,641	60,465	107,167	N/A	N/A	296,273
	43.40%	20.40%	36.39%			
CITY TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	128,436	48,019	104,811	1,781	2,646	285,693
	44.95%	16.80%	36.68%	0.62%	0.93%	

4. HOUSING TENURE CHANGE

Commentary

N/hood - Higher than average level of owner occupation, though PRS has increased. There have been falls in the proportion of owner occupation and social rented provision.

Housing policy implications

Neighbourhood may benefit from new/replacement social rented provision

5 HOUSE TYPE

Detached

Semi detached

Terraced

Tenement

Conversion (within an original property)

Within a commercial building

Caravan/mobile structure

Shared dwelling

N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
148	3.13%	11,167	3.91%
563	11.89%	36,522	12.78%
1,286	27.16%	33,423	11.70%
2,635	55.66%	197,146	69.00%
68	1.44%	5,540	1.90%
12	0.25%	1,017	0.35%
16	0.33%	348	0.12%
6	0.13%	630	0.22%
4,734		285793	

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

Higher proportion of terraced housing in N/hood
Close to average for family housing

Housing policy implications

None. There is a reasonable balance in house-type provision

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

A Average Household size

N/hood	City
2.13%	2.02%

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

	N/hood	City
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	3416	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	3,354 98.19%	95.56%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	42 1.23%	2.52%
Over 1.5 persons per room	20 0.58%	0.95%

C occupancy

(Source: Census Table LC4106SC by Neighbourhood)

NEIGHBOURHOOD	All households	Occupancy rating +2 or more	Occupancy rating +1	Total U/occupation	U/occupied %	Occupancy rating 0	Occupancy rating -1 or less	Overcrowded %
All households	4734	1658	966	2624	55.42	1449	661	13.96
Owned	2784	1514	612	2126	76.36	506	152	5.45
Private rented or living rent free	558	71	104	175	31.36	255	128	22.94
Social rented	1392	73	250	323	23.2	688	381	27.37
CITY								
All households	285693	53242	83843	137085	47.98	98916	49692	17.39
Owned	130217	41005	43625	84630	64.99	32838	12749	9.79
Private rented or living rent free	50665	4029	12217	16246	32.07	21132	13287	26.23
Social rented	104811	8208	28001	36209	34.54	44946	23656	22.57

6. OVERCROWDING AND UNDER OCCUPATION

Commentary

- A** Close to average household size
Higher than average proportion not sharing
- B** bedrooms
More than half of households overcrowding or
- C** under occupying in social rented sector

Housing Policy Implications

Less than half of all social rented provision appears to meet actual household requirements in terms of the number of bedrooms to meet the needs of existing households. Providers could organise surveys to test for mismatch, review letting arrangements and consider new provision

7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Occupied household spaces

Occupied household spaces with no central heating

N/hood	N/hood	City
	4,374	11,379
172	3.63%	3.98%

Commentary

Proportion of households without central heating close to city average

Housing Policy Implications

None

8 VACANT PROPERTIES (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

<i>Vacant properties as a proportion of all properties</i>	N/hood	N/hood	City
All Household spaces		4,848	293,876
Vacant household spaces	110	2.27%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	4	0.08%	0.19%
Occupied	4734	97.65%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES

Commentary

Vacancy rate close to city average

Housing Policy Implications

None

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

A Long term health/disability in a household

	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	980	9.69%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	940	9.29%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	8197	81.02%	79.43%
	10117		

B Long term health condition in a household

	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	7259	71.75%	69.01%
Physical disability	601	5.94%	7.82%
Mental health condition	525	5.19%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	585	5.78%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	246	2.43%	2.49%
Learning disability	51	0.50%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	197	1.95%	2.14%
Development disorder	77	0.76%	0.64%

C Provision of Care in a household

1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	623	6.16%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	130	1.28%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	208	2.05%	2.88%

D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household

494	6.69%	8.43%
-----	-------	-------

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

N/hood residents have slightly better mobility

A than city average

N/hood residents have slightly less long term

B health issues than city as a whole

N/hood residents affected more likely to require

C shorter term unpaid care

Lower proportion of long term sick and disabled in

D working age population

Housing Policy Implications

None at present

10 ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Census 2011)

A Ethnic Origin

	PROFILE	N/hood	City
White British or Irish	9069	89.64%	84.56%
White Other	325	3.21%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	44	0.43%	0.48%
Indian	153	1.51%	1.46%
Pakistani	216	2.13%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	4	0.04%	0.08%
Chinese	96	0.95%	1.79%
Other Asian	52	0.51%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	128	1.26%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	30	0.30%	0.64%
	10117		

B Country of Birth

Born outside UK	859	8.49%	12.24%
-----------------	------------	--------------	---------------

C Spoken English

Does not speak English well or at all	160	1.58%	2.59%
---------------------------------------	------------	--------------	--------------

10. ETHNICITY COMMENTARY

Commentary

- A** Higher proportion of White (British) and White (Scottish) than city as a whole
- Lower proportion of residents born outside UK than
- B** rest of city
- Lower proportion of non English speakers in N/hood
- C** compared to rest of city

Housing policy implications

Neighbourhood appears to be less attractive to ethnic minority communities. Providers should consider marketing of properties for a wider diversity of ethnic groups.

OTHER ECONOMIC & SOCIAL INDICATORS RELATED TO HOUSING COSTS AND THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

11 Economic activity (All people aged 16 -74)	N/Hood %	City%
Economically active	68.83%	64.49%
Economically inactive	31.16%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	5.90%	9.05%
Full time students	10.54%	13.73%
Retired	12.52%	11.32%

12 Car Ownership

	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or vans	62.08%	49.18%

Commentary

The Neighbourhood has a slightly higher proportion of its population in employment, has a lower proportion of students living at home, a slightly higher proportion of retired persons under 74 years of age and higher levels of car ownership

From a housing affordability perspective, those residents who have never worked or who are long term unemployed is around half of the city average

