

BALORNOCK & BARMULLOCH 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		1,504	4,962	1,482	7,948
	N/hood %		18.92	62.44	18.64	
	cf city %		16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES		Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency		1,431	4,936	1,442	7,809
	N/hood %		18.32	63.21	18.46	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

Commentary

Population **decrease** of 139

The working age population as a proportion of total residents has increased but remains persistently lower than the city average. The population contains a higher proportion of over 65s than the city average

Housing Policy Implications

Neighbourhood requires to attract in new residents to encourage population growth

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood **3,363**

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	839	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.03%	
Proportion of all households	24.94%	14.46%

B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILD	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	492	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.85%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	58.64%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%

C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,060	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.61%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	31.52%	22.96%

D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	747	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.54%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	22.21%	16.96%

Single person households over 65	515	36,508
---	-----	--------

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

% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	12.82%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	15.31%	12.78%

E ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65	N/hood	City
---	---------------	-------------

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

ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65	578	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	17.18%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

- High proportion of lone parent households. 2% of whole city
- A** More than half of all lone parent households have dependent children
- B** Higher level of households with dependent children than city average
- C** Higher proportion of over 65s living on their own
- D** Much lower proportion of under 65 single households
- E**

Housing Policy Implications

Neighbourhood is not well balanced in terms of distribution of vulnerable households. Suggests a need to review letting policy

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	1,093	32.50%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	990	29.44%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	653	19.42%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	415	12.34%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people or more	163	4.85%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	36	1.07%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	12	0.35%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	1	0.03%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	3,363		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

Household sizes are generally larger than city average

This could be reflected in the proportion of larger family dwellings in the neighbourhood

Housing Policy Implications

The neighbourhood needs to attract in younger smaller households, though this may be difficult if current stock is dominated by three and four apartment properties

4 HOUSING TENURE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	Owner Occupied	Private Rented	Social Rented	Shared ownership	Rent free	Total
NEIGHBOURHOOD						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates)	1,512	235	1,719			3,466
	43.62%	6.78%	49.60%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	1,553	137	1,643	10	20	3,363
	46.18%	4.07%	48.85%			
CITY						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimate)	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

Owner occupation has declined since 2011, with a doubling of private rented sector housing as a proportion and an increase in social rented provision

Housing Policy Implications

It is likely that some ex RTB properties have been re-sold for private renting which could have management implications where there is mixed ownership in a block

| |

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	93	2.76%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	892	26.52%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	650	19.32%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	1,711	50.88%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	6	0.18%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	10	0.30%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	1	0.03%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	0	0.00%	630	0.22%
	3,363		285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

Neighbourhood has a relatively high proportion of family terraced and semi detached properties

Housing Policy Implications

In spite of demolitions within the Barmulloch tenements, there remains a relatively high proportion of stock in tenemental form. One aspect of the demand problem may be the need to allocate larger dwellings to larger families. This makes it more difficult to rehouse smaller households in the social rented stock. In addition, the neighbourhood borders the Red Road clearance area, and there is likely to have been some new build provisioning to cope with the clearance of the Red Road flats

Further local analysis of waiting lists and an assessment of the potential for other tenures to be considered as part of the Red Road regeneration is recommended

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	City
A Average Household size	2.32	2.02

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

	N/hood	City
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	2,150	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	2,042 94.97%	96.5%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	84 3.91%	2.52%
Over 1.5 persons per room	24 1.11%	0.95%

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 Underoccupy	Underoccupied %	Occupancy rating 0	Occupancy rating -1 or less	Overcrowded %
All households	3363	907	1055	1962	58.34	913	488	14.51
Owned	1563	612	484	1096	70.12	312	155	9.91
Private rented or living rent free	157	30	53	83	52.87	47	27	17.19
Social rented	1643	265	518	783	47.66	554	306	18.62
CITY								
All households	285693	53242	83843	137,085	47.98	98916	49692	17.39
Owned	130217	41005	43625	84,630	64.99	32838	12749	9.79
Private rented or living rent free	50665	4029	12217	16,246	32.07	21132	13287	26.23
Social rented	104811	8208	28001	36,209	34.54	44946	23656	22.57

6. OVERCROWDING AND UNDER OCCUPATION

Commentary

Average household size is slightly greater than

A city average

There is a slightly higher level of density than city

B average

Generally there is less overcrowding in the neighbourhood than city average in all tenures and a higher level of underoccupation in the social rented sector, which could be explained by the proportion of older households occupying

C larger family properties

Housing Policy Implications

There appears to be underoccupation throughout the area

Further research is required to determine both levels of underoccupation and overcrowding to identify ways of creating community balance and attracting new residents

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Occupied household spaces

Occupied household spaces with no central heating

	N/hood	N/hood	City	City
Occupied household spaces		3,363		
Occupied household spaces with no central heating	47	1.40%	11,379	3.98%

7. HEATING TYPE

Commentary

The proportion of properties without central heating is very low

Housing Policy Implications

The key question for housing managers is the extent to which the installed heating systems are being used and their affordability and any knock on impacts for tenants including ability to pay rent

8 VACANT PROPERTIES (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties

	N/hood	N/hood	City
All Household spaces		3,468	293,876
Vacant household spaces	105	3.12%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	0		0.19%
Occupied	3363	96.97%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES

Commentary

Area has a relatively high void rate

Housing Policy Implications

There may be pockets of difficult to let housing in the neighbourhood requiring management intervention

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood	7,948		
A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	1,443	18.16%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	903	11.36%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	5,602	70.48%	79.43%
B Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	4,953	62.31%	69.01%
Physical disability	829	10.43%	7.82%
Mental health condition	598	7.52%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	618	7.77%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	292	3.67%	2.49%
Learning disability	84	1.06%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	188	2.36%	2.14%
Development disorder	88	1.11%	0.64%
C Provision of Care in a household			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	278	3.49%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	243	3.05%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	431	5.42%	2.88%
D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household	715	12.47%	8.43%

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

Neighbourhood has higher proportion of

A residents with limiting medical conditions

Neighbourhood population has worse than

B average levels of disabilities across the board

Residents are highly dependent on unpaid care which reflects the levels of disability and

C impairment evident within the neighbourhood

Neighbourhood has on average one third more of its economically active population who are

D long term sick or disabled

Housing Policy Implications

Sections of the population of this neighbourhood are likely to require more integrated care and joint working

with housing professionals to deliver services which will improve the living conditions of residents

CENSUS
PROFILE
SUMMARY
Y N/hood City

ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census

A Neighbourhood Profiles)

Ethnic Origin

Frequency

Ethnic Origin	Y	N/hood	City
White British or Irish	7,550	97.63%	84.56%
White Other	79	0.99%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	16	0.20%	0.48%
Indian	26	0.33%	1.46%
Pakistani	18	0.22%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	1	0.01%	0.08%
Chinese	72	0.90%	1.79%
Other Asian	32	0.40%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	140	1.76%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	14	0.18%	0.64%
7,948			

B Country of Birth

Born outside UK	328	4.12%	12.24%
-----------------	-----	-------	---------------

C Spoken English

Does not speak English well or at all	158	1.98%	2.59%
---------------------------------------	-----	-------	--------------

10. ETHNICITY

Commentary

Neighbourhood has very low proportion of non

A British white residents

Small proportion of residents are born outwith the

B UK

Proportion of residents who do not speak English is

C similar to city average

Housing Policy Implications

Encouraging migrants, asylum seekers and refugees to settle in the neighbourhood may boost population
however, the area is fragile across a range of indicators

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	59.42%	64.49%
Economically inactive	40.58%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	12.08%	9.05%
Full time students	7.01%	13.73%
Retired	14.91%	11.32%

12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or va	46.01%	49.18%

Commentary

The Neighbourhood has lower 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 lower levels of car ownership
From a housing affordability perspective, those residents who have never worked or are long term unemployed is 3 percentage points above the city average

