TOTAL

### DRUMCHAPEL NEIGHBOURHOOD

# **1 POPULATION PROFILE 3-YEAR CHANGE**

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

Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	POP
Frequency	3,247	8,469	1,344	13,060
N/hood %	24.86	64.85	10.29	
cf city %	16.12	70.03	13.85	
				TOTAL
Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	POP
Frequency	3,085	8,192	1,505	12,782
N/hood %	24.13	64.1	11.77	
cf city %	16.13	69.94	13.93	
	Frequency N/hood % cf city % Age band Frequency N/hood %	Frequency    3,247      N/hood %    24.86      cf city %    16.12      Age band    0 - 15      Frequency    3,085      N/hood %    24.13	Frequency    3,247    8,469      N/hood %    24.86    64.85      cf city %    16.12    70.03      Age band    0 - 15    16 - 64      Frequency    3,085    8,192      N/hood %    24.13    64.1	Frequency    3,247    8,469    1,344      N/hood %    24.86    64.85    10.29      cf city %    16.12    70.03    13.85      Age band    0 - 15    16 - 64    65+      Frequency    3,085    8,192    1,505      N/hood %    24.13    64.1    11.77

# 1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

Commentary

Total population **decrease** of 278 (2%)

Higher child population than average for city but still falling; proportion of over 65s increasing. Working age population lower than city average and has declined

### **Housing Policy Implications**

Suggests requirement for an increase in housing supply to boost population base and support school rolls.

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

Total Households in neighbourhood	5,707	(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)
A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,634	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	3.95%	
Proportion of all households	28.63%	14.46%
LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT		
<b>B</b> CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,190	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in	4.49%	
N/HOOD	72.82%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%
C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	2,137	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood As a percentage of Households with dependent children	3.25%	
in Neighbourhood	37.44%	22.96%
D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	715	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood <b>Proportion of all households which contain only over</b>	1.47%	
65s	12.53%	16.96%

	Single person households over 65	589	36,508	
	(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Ne	ighbourhood)		
	% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood % of households single person over 65 as a proportion	1.61%		
	of all households	10.32%	12.78%	
Ε	ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65	N/hood	City	
	ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65	1507	86,728	
	Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	26.40%	30.35%	
	2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION			
	Commentary			
	N/hood has significantly higher than average proportion			
Α	of lone parent households			
	Proportion of lone parent households with dependent			

- B children is higher than rest of cityN/hood has a higher proportion of households with
- C dependent children than city average
  N/hood contains lower proportion of all-over 65
  D households than situ average and single over 65
- **D** households than city average and single over 65s Lower than city average proportion of one person
- ${\bf E}\,$  households under 65

1

# **Housing Policy Implications**

Housing providers should consider balance of provision and support mechanisms to ensure sustained tenancies. Also should consider supply of properties with sufficient bedspaces to meet the needs of larger families

# **3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE**

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

		N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	2,096	36.72%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	1,567	27.45%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	1,068	18.71%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	594	10.40%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	287	5.02%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	64	1.12%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	23	0.40%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	8	0.14%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	5,707		

### **3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE**

Commentary

One and two person households lower than city average

### Housing Policy Implications

There is an urgent need to encourage newly forming households into the area. The higher proportion of larger families compared to city averages suggests continuing demand for larger dwellings. Local providers need to consider and address any mismatch between supply and demand.

4 HOUSING TENURE	(Source: 2011 0	Census Neighbo	ourhood Profile	es unless otherv	vise stated)	
	Owner	Private	Social	Shared		
NEIGHBOURHOOD	Occupied	Rented	Rented	ownership	Rent free	Total
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates)	1,145	287	4,390			5,822
	19.67%	4.93%	75.40%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	1,200	192	4,226	67	22	5,707
	21.03%	3.36%	74.04%			

CITY

TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates)	128,641	60,465	107,167	N/A	N/A	296,273
	43.40%	20.40%	36.39%			
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
In spite of the increase in housing supply, the
neighbourhood has a lower than average level of owner
occupation, which is also falling
Steady increase in private rented stock, although this
makes up a small proportion of total stock
Relative increase in proportion of social rented
provision
Housing Policy Implications
Social rented provision remains dominant. Providers
should consider tenure diversification in new build
schemes e.g. mid market rent, low cost home
ownership with the aim of increasing population in the
neighbourhood

# **5 HOUSE TYPE**

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	189	3.31%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	1,014	17.76%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	749	13.12%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	3,716	65.11%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	25	0.43%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	8	0.14%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	1	0.01%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	5	0.09%	630	0.22%
	5,707		285,793	

# 5. HOUSE TYPE Commentary

Neighbourhood is overwhelmingly tenement, although it does have a higher proportion of terraced and semi detached properties than the city as a whole.

#### Housing Policy Implications

New development should be at lower densities to consolidate and improve on variety and flexibility of house types to attract incomers and meet local need

# **6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS**

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	City
A Average Household size	2.25	2.02

<b>B</b> Dwelling Occupancy Rates		As a proporti	ion of households counted
		N/hood	City
Occupied Household count		3,683	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	3,485	94.62%	95.56%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	160	4.34%	2.52%
Over 1.5 persons per room	38	1.03%	0.95%
	3,683		

### C Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy

(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	5707	726	1682	2408	42.19	2254	1045	18.31
Owned	1267	333	494	827	65.27	300	140	11.04
Private rented or living rent free	214	23	62	85	39.72	97	32	14.95
Social rented	4226	370	1126	1496	35.39	1857	873	20.65
СІТҮ								
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 Higher than average household size
Similar to average proportion not sharing
B bedrooms
Overcrowding slightly below city average in social
rented sector but higher in owner occupied
properties. Underoccupation higher than city
C average in all sectors
Housing Policy Implications
Less than half of all social rented provision appears
to meet actual household requirements. Providers
could organise surveys to test for mismatch, review
letting arrangements and consider new provision.

7 HEATING TYPE	N/hood	N/hood	City	City
Occupied household spaces	5,707			
Occupied household spaces with no central heating	114	1.99%	11,379	3.98%

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

### 7. HEATING TYPE

#### Commentary

Proportion of households without central heating lower than city average

#### Housing Policy Implications

Further work is required to assess the suitability of these heating systems in terms of affordability and related insulation and other energy saving measures which could be applied to reduce costs for residents and reduce CO2 emissions

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

Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties	N/hood	N/hood	City
All Household spaces		5,801	293,876
Vacant household spaces	88	1.51%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	6	0.10%	0.19%
Occupied	5707	98.37%	97.21%

### 8. VACANCIES Commentary

Vacancy rate is lower than city average

#### Housing Policy Implications

None. Suggests that properties are in good demand

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

Total Residents in neighbourhood	13,060
----------------------------------	--------

A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	2,162	37.88%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	1,353	23.67%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	9,545	73.08%	79.43%

<b>B</b> Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	8,614	65.96%	69.01%
Physical disability	1,261	9.65%	7.82%
Mental health condition	1,167	8.93%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	702	5.37%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	352	2.69%	2.49%
Learning disability	103	0.79%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	391	2.99%	2.14%
Development disorder	165	1.26%	0.64%
<b>C</b> Provision of Care in a household			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	662	5.06%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	146	1.11%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	182	1.39%	2.88%
Lowe to we side on disabled 40. 74 years of and in a			

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

NW Glasgow Drumchapel 10

13.80%

8.43%

1,272

9. ⊦	EALTH & DISABLITY IN THE HOME
Con	nmentary
N/h	ood residents have significantly poorer mobility
A tha	n city average
N/h	ood residents have more long term health
<b>B</b> issu	es than city as a whole
N/h	ood residents affected more likely to require
<b>C</b> sho	rter term unpaid care
Ver	y high proportion of long term sick and disabled
<b>D</b> in w	vorking age population
Ηοι	using Policy Implications
	al providers should work with health and social
	e professionals to provide enhanced support
	carers, and make homes more accessible in
	ns of mobility, particularly residents requiring
tor	e discharged from hospital

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

Ethnic Origin		N/hood	City
White British or Irish	12,186	93.30%	84.56%
White Other	236	1.80%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	27	0.20%	0.48%
Indian	26	0.19%	1.46%
Pakistani	116	0.88%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	3	0.02%	0.08%
Chinese	90	0.69%	1.79%
Other Asian	60	0.45%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	283	2.16%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	33	0.25%	0.64%
	13,060		

•

B Country of Birth			
Born outside UK	721	5.52%	12.24%
C Spoken English			
Does not speak English well or at all	267	2.04%	2.59%
10. ETHNICITY COMMENTARY			
Commentary			
Higher proportion of White (British or Irish) than city as			
<b>A</b> a whole			
Lower proportion of residents born outside UK than rest <b>B</b> of city			
Similar proportion of non English speakers in N/hood			
<b>C</b> 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 & THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

11 Economic activity (All people aged 16 -74)	N/Hood %	City%
Economically active	60.00%	64.49%
Economically inactive	40.00%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	12.55%	9.05%
Full time students	7.72%	13.73%
Retired	10.18%	11.32%
12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or vans	38.60%	49.18%

#### Commentary

The Neighbourhood has much lower proportion of its population in employment. Students account for around 8% of the population which is below the city average. The proportion of retired people under 74 is slightly lower than the city average. Car ownership is lower than the city average

From a housing affordability perspective, the proportion of residents who have never worked or are long term unemployed is well above the city average.

