

**BAILLIESTON & GARROWHILL 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		3,181	12,321	2,878	<b>18,380</b>
	N/hood %		17.31	67.03	15.66	
	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		3,019	12,465	3,109	<b>18,593</b>
	N/hood %		16.24	67.04	16.72	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

**1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT**

**Commentary**

Population has **increased** by 273 (1.5%)

Numerical increases in working age population and older residents

**Housing policy implications**

The steady increase in population reflects growing housing demand in the neighbourhood

**2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION**

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

<b>Total Households in Neighbourhood</b>	<b>7,598</b>
<b>Total lone parent households in neighbourhood</b>	<b>537</b>

GLASGOW'S HOUSING STRATEGY 2017 - 2022 : NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILES

<b>A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	989	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.39%	
Proportion of all households	13.01%	14.46%

<b>B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	576	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.17%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	58.24%	
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	2,377	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	3.13%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	31.28%	22.96%

<b>D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	1,530	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	3.17%	
<b>Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s</b>	20.13%	16.96%

<b>Single person households over 65</b>	969	36,508	(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbourhood)
% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.65%		
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	12.75%	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	1149	86,728	
Proportion of one person HH under 65 as a proportion of all households	15.12%	30.35%	

**2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION**

**Commentary**

Lower proportion of one parent households than city

**A** average

Proportion of lone parent households with

**B** dependent children lower than city average

Higher proportion of households with dependent

**C** children than city average

Higher proportion of households containing over 65s

**D** than city average

Very much lower proportion of one person

**E** households who are under 65

**Housing policy implications**

Household composition reflects attractiveness and desirability of area for older households but also younger families. No significant housing implications

**3 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD SIZE**

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

	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
Occupied by One person	2,118	27.88%
Occupied by Two people	2,435	32.04%
Occupied by Three people	1,413	18.60%
Occupied by Four people	1,194	15.71%
Occupied by Five people or more	362	4.76%
Occupied by Six people	60	0.79%
Occupied by Seven people	13	0.17%
Occupied by Eight or more people	3	0.04%
<b>ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES</b>	<b>7,598</b>	

**3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE**

Much lower proportion of one person households than city average but much higher proportion of 3 and 4 person households

**Housing policy implications**

Possible increase in the number of houses designed to accommodate one-person households should be considered to take pressure off other areas of the city experiencing heavy demand

#### 4 HOUSING TENURE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	Owner Occupied	Private Rented	Social Rented	Shared ownership	Rent free	Total
NEIGHBOURHOOD						
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (2014)</b>	5,935	1,001	955			7,891
	<b>75.21%</b>	<b>12.68%</b>	<b>12.10%</b>			
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)</b>	5,927	562	1,039	9	61	7,598
	<b>78.00%</b>	<b>7.40%</b>	<b>13.67%</b>			
CITY						
<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
	44.95%	16.80%	36.68%	0.62%	0.93%	

#### 4. HOUSING TENURE CHANGE

##### Commentary

There has been a dramatic increase in the number and proportion of privately rented properties in this neighbourhood at the expense of both the owner occupied and social rented sectors

##### Housing policy implications

There are management implications in terms of estate management and common property maintenance in flatted and tenemental properties and house resale and tenanted property values may also be affected

## 5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	1,312	17.21%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	3,091	40.55%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	1,685	22.11%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	1,500	19.68%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	12	0.16%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	20	0.26%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	1	0.01%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	0	0.00%	630	0.22%
	<b>7,621</b>		<b>285793</b>	

### 5. HOUSE TYPE

#### Commentary

The neighbourhood has one of the highest levels of family homes in the city (80%) and a correspondingly lower proportion of tenements

#### Housing policy implications

None at present

## 6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	City
<b>A Average Household size</b>	2.41%	2.02%

### B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

	N/hood	City
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	5,022	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	4,890	96.5%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	94	2.52%
Over 1.5 persons per room	38	0.95%

**Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy**

**C**

(Source: Census Table LC4106SC by Neighbourhood (amalgamated by datazone-adjusted for Easterhouse) )

**NEIGHBOURHOOD**

All households  
Owned  
Private rented or living rent free  
Social rented

All households	Occupancy rating +2 or more	Occupancy rating +1	Total Underoccupation	Underoccupied %	Occupancy rating 0	Occupancy rating -1 or less	Overcrowded %
7598	2723	2313	5036	66.28	1842	720	9.48
5936	2546	1823	4369	73.6	1158	409	6.89
623	79	143	222	35.63	259	142	22.79
1039	98	347	445	42.82	425	169	16.26

**CITY**

All households  
Owned  
Private rented or living rent free  
Social rented

285693	53242	83843	137,085	47.98	98916	49692	17.39
130217	41005	43625	84,630	64.99	32838	12749	9.79
50665	4029	12217	16,246	32.07	21132	13287	26.23
104811	8208	28001	36,209	34.54	44946	23656	22.57

**6. OVERCROWDING AND UNDER OCCUPATION**

**Commentary**

- A** Higher average household size than city average  
Neighbourhood has lower much lower
- B** occupation densities than rest of city

Very low levels of overcrowding (half city average), however overcrowding in the Private

- C** Rented Sector is higher than might be expected

**Housing policy implications**

There should be a policy response in confirming and treating overcrowding in the private rented sector

<b>7 HEATING TYPE</b> (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profi	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>	
Occupied household spaces	7,598		285,693	
<b>Occupied household spaces with no central heating</b>	158	2.08%	11,379	3.98%

**7 HEATING TYPE COMMENTARY**

Lower proportion of properties without central heating than city average

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

*Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties*

	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
<b>All Household spaces</b>	<b>7,714</b>		<b>293,876</b>
Vacant household spaces	109	1.42%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	7	0.09%	0.19%
Occupied	7598	98.50%	97.21%

**8. VACANCIES**

**Commentary**

Much lower rate of vacant properties than city average

**Housing policy implications**

None

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

<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	2,095	11.39%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	1,770	9.63%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	14,515	79.00%	79.43%

<b>B Long term health condition in a household</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
<b>Resident population</b>	<b>18,380</b>		
No condition	12,982	70.63%	69.01%
Physical disability	1,271	6.91%	7.82%
Mental health condition	779	4.24%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	1,127	6.13%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	400	2.18%	2.49%
Learning disability	85	0.46%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	248	1.35%	2.14%
Development disorder	105	0.57%	0.64%
<b>C Provision of Care in a household</b>			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	971	5.27%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	446	2.42%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	591	3.21%	2.88%
<b>D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household</b>	<b>797</b>	<b>5.73%</b>	<b>8.43%</b>

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

**Commentary**

Generally similar pattern of long term health issues

**A** to city as a whole

Generally lower than average rates of specific

**B** disabilities

Residents in the neighbourhood appear to require a higher level of care within the home

**C** than city as a whole

Proportion of working age population long term

**D** sick or disabled is half of city average

**Housing policy implications**

Some evidence that a higher number of residents will require some form of care in the home

**10 ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Census 2011)**

**A Ethnic Origin**

**WHITE British or Irish**

WHITE Other

**MIXED OR MULTIPLE ETHIC GROUPS**

INDIAN

PAKISTANI

BANGLADESHI

CHINESE

OTHER ASIAN

AFRICAN, CARIBBEAN OR BLACK

OTHER ETHNIC GROUP

	N/hood	N/hood %	City	City %
<b>WHITE British or Irish</b>	17,611	<b>95.82%</b>	501,623	<b>84.56%</b>
WHITE Other	166	<b>0.90%</b>	22,938	<b>3.87%</b>
<b>MIXED OR MULTIPLE ETHIC GROUPS</b>	30	<b>0.16%</b>	2,879	<b>0.48%</b>
INDIAN	76	<b>0.41%</b>	8,640	<b>1.46%</b>
PAKISTANI	161	<b>0.87%</b>	22,405	<b>3.78%</b>
BANGLADESHI	1	<b>0.01%</b>	458	<b>0.08%</b>
CHINESE	200	<b>1.09%</b>	10,689	<b>1.79%</b>
OTHER ASIAN	59	<b>0.32%</b>	5,566	<b>0.94%</b>
AFRICAN, CARIBBEAN OR BLACK	59	<b>0.32%</b>	14,246	<b>2.40%</b>
OTHER ETHNIC GROUP	17	<b>0.09%</b>	3,801	<b>0.64%</b>
	<b>18,380</b>		<b>593,245</b>	

**B Country of Birth**

Born outside UK

**597**

**3.24%**

**12.24%**

**C Spoken English**

Does not speak English well or at all

**211**

**1.15%**

**2.59%**

**10. ETHNICITY COMMENTARY**

**Commentary**

Neighbourhood has very low proportion of residents

**A** who are non white

Much lower proportion of residents born out-with

**B** the UK

Lower proportion of residents who do not speak

**C** English than city as a whole

**Housing policy implications**

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

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

**11 Economic activity (All people aged 16 -74)**

**N/Hood %**

**City%**

Economically active

**70.57%**

64.49%

Economically inactive

**29.43%**

35.51%

Never worked and long term unemployed

**4.38%**

9.05%

Full time students

**9.05%**

13.73%

Retired

**14.08%**

11.32%

**12 Car Ownership**

**N/Hood**

**City**

Proportion of Households with one or more cars or va

**73.27%**

49.18%

**Commentary**

The Neighbourhood has 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 significantly 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

