

**BLAIRDARDIE 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	642	2,472	754	<b>3,868</b>
	N/hood %	16.6	63.9	19.49	
	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	648	2,449	740	<b>3,837</b>
	N/hood %	16.89	63.82	19.28	
	cf city %	16.13	69.94	13.93	

**1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT**

**Commentary**

Total population **decrease** of 31 (-1.08%)

Higher proportion of older people than the city average

**Housing Policy Implications**

Area may benefit from more new build which could boost population in what is an essentially suburban neighbourhood.

## 2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

**Total Households in neighbourhood**      **1,803**      (Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

<b>A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	253	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.61%	
Proportion of all households	14.03%	14.46%

<b>B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	144	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.54%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	56.92%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%

<b>C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	451	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.69%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children in Neighbourhood	25.01%	22.96%

**HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS**

**D OVER 65 YEARS**

	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	479	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	26.57%	
<b>Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s</b>	0.99%	16.96%

**Single person households over 65**

	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>	
% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	361	36,508	(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbourhood)
	0.99%		
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	20.02%	12.78%	

**E**

**ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65**

	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>	(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbourhood)
ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65	345	86,728	
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	19.13	30.35%	

## **2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION**

### **Commentary**

N/hood has lower than average proportion of lone parent households  
Proportion of lone parent households with dependent children is lower than city average

Proportion of households with dependent children is higher than city average

Neighbourhood has a considerably higher proportion of all over age 65 households

Conversely the proportion of households who are under 65 is lower than the city average

### **Housing Policy Implications**

The neighbourhood appears to have an increasingly ageing population. Not only will housing providers have to consider meeting the needs of this population, but also boosting the proportion of properties which will attract younger households and families with children

### 3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	706	39.16%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	533	29.56%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	268	14.86%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	213	11.81%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	68	3.77%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	10	0.55%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	3	0.17%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	2	0.11%	0.16%
<b>ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES</b>	<b>1,803</b>		

### 3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

#### 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

In spite of the numbers of larger dwellings, the area does not appear to be attracting families.  
Consideration could be given to assessing stock against occupancy.

GLASGOW'S HOUSING STRATEGY 2017 - 2022 : NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILES

<b>4 HOUSING TENURE</b>	Owner Occupied	Private Rented	Social Rented	Shared ownership	Rent free	Total
(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)						
NEIGHBOURHOOD						
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (2014)</b> (Housing Stock Estimates)	1,072 <b>58.99%</b>	135 <b>7.42%</b>	610 <b>33.57%</b>			1,817
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)</b>	1,079 <b>59.84%</b>	69 <b>3.83%</b>	633 <b>35.11%</b>	4 0.22%	18 1.00%	1,803
CITY						
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (2014)</b>	128,641 <b>43.40%</b>	60,465 <b>20.40%</b>	107,167 <b>36.39%</b>	N/A	N/A	296,273
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)</b>	128,436 <b>44.95%</b>	48,019 <b>16.80%</b>	104,811 <b>36.68%</b>	1,781 <b>0.62%</b>	2,646 <b>0.93%</b>	285,693

**4. HOUSING TENURE CHANGE**

**Commentary**

Slightly lower level of home ownership and social rented, although private rented sector has increased

**Housing Policy Implications**

None

## 5 HOUSE TYPE

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	165	9.15%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	363	20.13%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	628	34.83%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	646	35.83%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	1	0.06%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	0	0.00%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	0	0.00%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	0	0.00%	630	0.22%
	<b>1,803</b>		<b>285,793</b>	

### 5. HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

#### Commentary

Higher proportion of terraced properties in N/hood

Higher than average provision of family housing in N/hood. "Tenement" includes multi storey flatted property south of Great Western Rd

#### Housing Policy Implications

None

**UNDER AND OVER**

**6 OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS**

**A Average Household size**

	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
	2.15	2.02

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

**B Dwelling Occupancy Rates**

*Occupied Household count*  
Up to 0.5 persons per room  
  
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room  
Over 1.5 persons per room

	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>As a proportion of households counted</b>
	1,265	1,301	202,466
	25	97.23%	95.56%
	11	1.92%	2.52%
	<b>1,301</b>	0.85%	0.95%

**Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy**

**C**

	Occupancy rating +2 or more	Occupancy rating +1	Total U/occupation	U/occupied %	Occupancy rating 0	Occupancy rating -1 or less	Over crowded %
--	-----------------------------	---------------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------------	----------------

**NEIGHBOURHOOD**

All households  
Owned  
Private rented or living rent free  
Social rented

All households	1803	532	633	1165	64.61	458	180	9.98
Owned	1083	465	346	811	74.88	195	77	7.1
Private rented or living rent free	87	20	27	47	54.02	32	8	9.19
Social rented	633	47	260	307	48.5	231	95	15.01

**CITY**

All households  
Owned  
Private rented or living rent free  
Social rented

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**

Close to average household size

Higher than average not sharing bedrooms

High degree of underoccupation in owned properties

**Housing Policy Implications**

There is a high level of underoccupancy which may reflect the household sizes and an ageing population. The policy focus is likely to be on ensuring that these households are able to remain as long as possible in their own homes although this will have resource implications, unless alternative retirement accommodation is made available locally

**7 HEATING TYPE**

Occupied household spaces

**Occupied household spaces with no central heating**

N/hood

N/hood

City

City

(Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

1,803

57

3.00%

11,379

3.98%

## 7. HEATING TYPE

### Commentary

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

### Housing Policy Implications

The policy focus is likely to be on making properties as energy efficient as possible

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

	N/hood	N/hood	City	
<b>All Household spaces</b>		<b>1,825</b>	<b>293,876</b>	
Vacant household spaces	21	1.15%	2.59%	
Second residence/holiday home	1	0.05%	0.19%	
Occupied	1,803	98.79%	97.21%	<i>Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties</i>

## 8. VACANCIES

### Commentary

The vacancy rate is higher than might be expected

### Housing Policy Implications

The current vacancy rate should be compared with the Census findings and if the pattern is repeated, the reasons for higher vacancy rates should be explored

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

**Total Residents in neighbourhood**                      **3,868**

<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	537	13.88%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	414	10.70%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	2,917	75.41%	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	2,521	65.18%	69.01%
Physical disability	382	9.88%	7.82%
Mental health condition	201	5.20%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	304	7.86%	6.08%
Blindness or partial sight loss	135	3.49%	2.49%
Learning disability	18	0.47%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	57	1.47%	2.14%
Development disorder	29	0.75%	0.64%

<b>C Provision of Care in a household</b>			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	243	6.28%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	86	2.22%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	154	3.98%	2.88%

<b>D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household</b>			
	207	5.35%	8.43%

## **9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME**

### **Commentary**

N/hood residents have slightly worse mobility than the City

N/hood residents have slightly worse physical disabilities than the City

N/hood residents affected more likely to require shorter term unpaid care

Lower proportion of long term sick and disabled in working age population

### **Housing Policy Implications**

In spite of the apparent relatively good health of the population, there is some evidence that mobility is an issue and this could have implications for providers in terms of providing aids and adaptations

**A ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS** (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

<b>Ethnic Origin</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
White British or Irish	3,635	93.98%	<b>84.56%</b>
White Other	37	0.96%	<b>3.87%</b>
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	5	0.13%	<b>0.48%</b>
Indian	34	0.88%	<b>1.46%</b>
Pakistani	38	0.98%	<b>3.78%</b>
Bangladeshi	3	0.08%	<b>0.08%</b>
Chinese	20	0.52%	<b>1.79%</b>
Other Asian	34	0.88%	<b>0.94%</b>
African, Caribbean or Black	53	1.37%	<b>2.40%</b>
Other ethnic group	9	0.23%	<b>0.64%</b>
	<b>3,868</b>		

**B Country of Birth**

Born outside UK	211	5.46%	<b>12.24%</b>
-----------------	-----	-------	---------------

**C Spoken English**

Does not speak English well or at all	57	1.47%	<b>2.59%</b>
---------------------------------------	----	-------	--------------

**10. ETHNICITY**

**Commentary**

Higher proportion of White (British) and White (Scottish) than city as a whole

Lower proportion of residents born outside UK than rest of city

Lower proportion of non English speakers in N/hood compared to rest of city

**Housing Policy Implications**

attractive to ethnic minority

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

<b>Economic activity (All people aged 16 -74 N/Hood %</b>	<b>N/Hood %</b>	<b>City%</b>
Economically active	<b>66.17%</b>	64.49%
Economically inactive	<b>33.82%</b>	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	<b>7.03%</b>	9.05%
Full time students	<b>7.10%</b>	13.73%
Retired	<b>16.04%</b>	11.32%

<b>12 Car Ownership</b>	<b>N/Hood</b>	<b>City</b>
more cars or vans	<b>57.18%</b>	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 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 are long term unemployed is around 2 percentage points below the city average

