

**BROOMHILL & PARTICK WEST NEIGHBOURHOOD**

**1 POPULATION PROFILE 3-YEAR CHANGE**

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

<b>2011 CENSUS</b>		<b>Age band</b>	<b>0 - 15</b>	<b>16 - 64</b>	<b>65+</b>	<b>TOTAL POP</b>
	Frequency		1,159	9,206	1,397	<b>11,762</b>
	N/hood %		9.85	78.27	11.88	
	cf city %		16.12	70.03	13.85	
<b>2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES</b>		<b>Age band</b>	<b>0 - 15</b>	<b>16 - 64</b>	<b>65+</b>	<b>TOTAL POP</b>
	Frequency		1,281	9,499	1,447	<b>12,227</b>
	N/hood %		10.48	77.68	11.83	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

**1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT**

**Commentary**

Total population has **increased** by nearly 4%  
 Increase in proportion of children suggests growth in demand for family accommodation, although the proportion of children in the population is well below the city average

**Housing Policy Implications**

The extent to which supply is keeping up with increasing demand is open to question. Further investigation is required as to land availability and potential impact of higher density living

**2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION****2 IN ACCOMMODATION**

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

**Total Households in neighbourhood****6,936****A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS****N/hood****City**

In Neighbourhood

476

41,315

% of city total in this Neighbourhood

1.15%

Proportion of all households

6.86%

14.46%

**LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT****B CHILDREN****N/hood****City**

In Neighbourhood

286

26,513

% of city total in this Neighbourhood

1.08%

As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in  
N/HOOD

60.08%

As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households

64.17%

**C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN****N/hood****City**

In Neighbourhood

874

65,612

% of city total in this Neighbourhood

1.33%

As a percentage of Households with dependent  
children

12.60%

22.96%

GLASGOW'S HOUSING STRATEGY 2017 - 2022 : NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILES

<b>D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	957	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	13.80%	
<b>Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s</b>	1.98%	16.96%
<b>Single person households over 65</b>	755	36,508
(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbourhood)		
% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.06%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	10.89%	12.78%
<b>E ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbourhood)		
ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65	2980	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	42.96%	30.35%

## **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 lower than the city average

N/hood has lower proportion of households with  
**C** dependent children than city average

N/hood has a lower proportion single person over 65s  
**D** than the city average

N/hood has a much higher proportion of under 65  
**E** single person households than the city average

### **Housing Policy Implications**

Availability of (and therefore cost of) housing likely to be pressured given trend towards increasing population. Signals a need for the creation of more affordable accommodation for newly forming households

### 3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	3735	53.85%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	2168	31.26%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	640	9.23%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	289	4.17%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	74	1.07%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	23	0.33%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	4	0.06%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	3	0.04%	0.16%
<b>ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES</b>	<b>6,936</b>		

### 3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

#### Commentary

One person households significantly higher than the city average

Likely to reflect size of older tenemental housing stock

#### Housing Policy Implications

Demand for one person housing remains high although this may be a reflection of the first time buyers market in this part of the city and the profile of the working age population seeking 1 and 2 bedroom flats. However it also suggests that demand may actually be growing relative to supply.

## 4 HOUSING TENURE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

NEIGHBOURHOOD	Owner Occupied	Private Rented	Social Rented	Shared ownership	Rent free	Total
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (2014)</b> (Housing Stock Estimates)	3,236	2,489	1455			7,180
	<b>45.06%</b>	<b>34.66%</b>	<b>20.26%</b>			
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)</b>	3,340	2,108	1,463	39	86	7,036
	<b>47.47%</b>	<b>29.96%</b>	<b>20.79%</b>			
<b>CITY</b>						
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (2014)</b>	128,641	60,465	107,167	N/A	N/A	296,273
	<b>43.40%</b>	<b>20.40%</b>	<b>36.39%</b>			
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)</b>	128,436	48,019	104,811	1,781	2,646	285,693
	<b>44.95%</b>	<b>16.80%</b>	<b>36.68%</b>	<b>0.62%</b>	<b>0.93%</b>	

### 4. HOUSING TENURE CHANGE

#### Commentary

Proportion of private rented sector housing is substantially higher in N/hood than city average

#### Housing Policy Implications

Demand for rented accommodation likely to be rising in both private and social rented sectors

**5 HOUSE TYPE**

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>% of stock</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>% of stock</b>
<b>Detached</b>	36	0.52%	11,167	3.91%
<b>Semi detached</b>	170	2.45%	36,522	12.78%
<b>Terraced</b>	542	7.81%	33,423	11.70%
<b>Tenement</b>	6,059	87.36%	197,146	69.00%
<b>Conversion (within an original property)</b>	96	1.38%	5,540	1.90%
<b>Within a commercial building</b>	15	0.22%	1,017	0.35%
<b>Caravan/mobile structure</b>	2	0.03%	348	0.12%
<b>Shared dwelling</b>	16	0.23%	630	0.22%
	<b>6,936</b>		<b>285,793</b>	

**5. HOUSE TYPE****Commentary**

Much higher proportion of tenemental stock than the city average. Tenements will include multi storey flats.

**Housing Policy Implications**

There appears to be a shortage of lower density family properties in the neighbourhood, suggesting that where possible a more balanced stock type and density mix should be sought

## UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF 6 DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	City
<b>A Average Household size</b>	1.69	2.02

### B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

	N/hood	City
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	5,171	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	5,110 98.82%	95.56%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	43 0.83%	2.52%
Over 1.5 persons per room	18 0.35%	0.95%
	<b>5,171</b>	

### C Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy <sup>2</sup>

(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	Over crowded %
All households	6936	960	1590	2550	36.76	2931	1455	20.98
Owned	3279	760	873	1633	49.8	1169	477	14.55
Private rented or living rent free	2194	120	401	521	23.75	1050	623	28.39
Social rented	1463	80	316	396	27.06	712	355	24.26
<b>CITY</b>								
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** Under average household size
- B** Higher than average proportion not sharing bedrooms  
There is a high level of overcrowding in all tenures in relation to city averages. Levels of underoccupation
- C** are below the city average in all tenures

### Housing Policy Implications

Overcrowding appears to be an issue. Providers could organise surveys to test for mismatch, review letting arrangements and consider new provision

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

## 7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Occupied household spaces

	N/hood	N/hood	City	City
Occupied household spaces		6,936		
<b>Occupied household spaces with no central heating</b>	384	5.54%	11,379	3.98%

## 7. HEATING TYPE

### Commentary

Proportion of those living without central heating is above the city average

### Housing Policy Implications

The reasons for the relatively low provision of central heating should be explored

**8 VACANT PROPERTIES** (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

<i>Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties</i>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
<b>All Household spaces</b>		<b>7,227</b>	<b>293,876</b>
Vacant household spaces	243	3.36%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	48	0.66%	0.19%
Occupied	6,936	95.97%	97.21%

**8. VACANCIES**  
**Commentary**  
 Vacancy rate higher than city average

**Housing Policy Implications**

The vacancy rate is surprisingly high considering the relatively high demand for accommodation. A local or joint strategy to locate and address empty properties would be desirable

**9 HEALTH & DISABILITY** (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

**Total Residents in neighbourhood** **11,762**

<b>A Long term health/disability in a household</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
Day to day activity limited a lot	973	8.27%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	1,044	8.88%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	9,745	82.85%	79.43%

<b>B Long term health condition in a household</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
No condition	8,673	73.74%	69.01%
Physical disability	644	5.48%	7.82%
Mental health condition	696	5.92%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	590	5.02%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	237	2.01%	2.49%
Learning disability	37	0.31%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	204	1.73%	2.14%
Development disorder	56	0.48%	0.64%
<b>C Provision of Care in a household</b>			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	584	4.97%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	130	1.11%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	163	1.39%	2.88%
<b>D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household</b>	559	5.64%	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

CENSUS  
SUMMARY      **N/hood**      **City**

**ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS** (Source: Census

**A** Neighbourhood Profiles)

**Ethnic Origin**

	Frequency		
White British or Irish	10,152	86.31%	<b>84.56%</b>
White Other	520	4.42%	<b>3.87%</b>
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	108	0.92%	<b>0.48%</b>
Indian	192	1.63%	<b>1.46%</b>
Pakistani	150	1.28%	<b>3.78%</b>
Bangladeshi	13	0.11%	<b>0.08%</b>
Chinese	283	2.41%	<b>1.79%</b>
Other Asian	131	1.11%	<b>0.94%</b>
African, Caribbean or Black	127	1.08%	<b>2.40%</b>
Other ethnic group	86	0.73%	<b>0.64%</b>
	<b>11,762</b>		

**B Country of Birth**

Born outside UK	1,485	12.62%	<b>12.24%</b>
-----------------	-------	--------	---------------

**C Spoken English**

Does not speak English well or at all	142	1.21%	<b>2.59%</b>
---------------------------------------	-----	-------	--------------

**10. ETHNICITY**

**Commentary**

- Slightly higher proportion of White British or Irish than **A** city as a whole
- Slightly higher proportion of residents born outside UK **B** than 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**

<b>11 Economic activity (All people aged 16 -74)</b>	<b>N/Hood %</b>	<b>City%</b>
Economically active	<b>73.20%</b>	64.49%
Economically inactive	<b>26.79%</b>	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	<b>4.40%</b>	9.05%
Full time students	<b>14.25%</b>	13.73%
Retired	<b>8.87%</b>	11.32%

**12 Car Ownership**

Proportion of Households with one or more cars or vans

**N/Hood****55.70%****City**

49.18%

**Commentary**

The Neighbourhood has much higher proportion of its population in employment, has more students domiciled in the area, a lower proportion of retired people under 74 and higher levels of car ownership - this could impact on quality of life especially for children and older people living close to the main arterial routes.

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

