BLACKHILL & HOGGANFIELD 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	661	2,273	408	**3,342**
N/hood %	19.77	68.01	12.21	
cf city %	16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
Frequency	705	2,289	451	**3,445**
N/hood %	20.46	66.44	13.09	
cf city %	16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT
Commentary
Population has **increased** by 103
Neighbourhood has a consistently higher average child population, however working age population has fallen slightly, and the proportion of over 65s has risen slightly

Housing Policy Implications
There are no obvious housing policy implications, other than that there may some need to consider additional family housing and housing for older persons

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood   **1,427**

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS

	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	290	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.70%	
Proportion of all households	20.32%	14.46%

B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	184	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.89%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	63.61%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%

C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	456	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.69%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	31.95%	22.96%

D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS

	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	212	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	0.56%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	14.85%	16.96%

Single person households over 65	133	36,508

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

% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	0.36%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	9.32%	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	266	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	18.64%	30.35%

---

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

A Neighbourhood has a higher proportion of lone parent families than the rest of the city

B Proportion of lone parent families with dependent children is in line with city average

C Neighbourhood has a much higher proportion of families with dependent children than the city average

D There is a slightly lower proportion of single households over 65 than the city average

E Neighbourhood has a much lower proportion of one person households under 65

Housing Policy Implications

There are no housing policy implications

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	399	29.59%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	493	33.45%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	276	19.03%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	188	13.25%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	57	3.67%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	8	0.52%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	4	0.35%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	2	12.00%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	**1,427**		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE
Commentary
Neighbourhood has higher proportion of two, three and four person households but much lower proportion of one person households than city average
Housing Policy Implications
None. Reflects suburban nature of housing stock in neighbourhood

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)	807	177	503			1,487
	54.27%	11.90%	33.82%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	824	111	478	3	11	1,427
	57.74%	7.78%	33.50%			

CITY

TENURE COMPARISON (2014)(Housing Stock Estimates and Stock Change Comparator 2009/2014)	128,641 **43.40%**	60,465 **20.40%**	107,167 **36.39%**	N/A	N/A	296,273
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	128,436 44.95%	48,019 16.80%	104,811 36.68%	1,781 0.62%	2,646 0.93%	285,693

4. HOUSING TENURE CHANGE

Commentary

Higher proportion of owner occupied properties than city average, but falling as a result of increase in private rented tenancies. Slight increase in social rented stock

Housing Policy Implications

None in relation to housing supply

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	201	14.08%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	512	35.87%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	161	11.28%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	550	38.54%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	3	0.02%	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%
	1,427		**285,793**	

5. HOUSE TYPE
Commentary
Neighbourhood has high proportion of family homes and a lower proportion of tenements than city average

Housing Policy Implications
None

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	City
A Average Household size	2.34	2.02

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates — As a proportion of households counted

		N/hood	City
Occupied Household count		906	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	870	96.02%	96.5.%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	33	3.64%	2.52%
Over 1.5 persons per room	3	0.33%	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 Underoccupation	Underoccupied %	Occupancy rating 0	Occupancy rating -1 or less	Overcrowded %
All households	1427	363	457	820	57.46	401	206	14.43
Owned	827	269	290	559	67.59	192	76	9.19
Private rented or living rent free	122	24	36	60	49.18	46	16	13.11
Social rented	478	70	131	201	42.05	163	114	23.84

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                                             │
│                                                          │
│ A Average household size is greater than city average    │
│ B Housing density is similar to city average             │
│   Underoccupation is higher than city average and        │
│   overcrowding lower, except in the social rented        │
│ C sector, where it is marginally higher.                 │
│   Housing Policy Implications                            │
│   There are no significant policy implications           │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	N/hood	City	City
7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)				
Occupied household spaces		1,427		
Occupied household spaces with no central heating	28	1.96%	11,379	3.98%

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│ 7. HEATING TYPE                                          │
│ Commentary                                               │
│                                                          │
│ Neighbourhood has a lower proportion of properties       │
│ lacking central heating than city average                │
│ Housing Policy Implications                              │
│ None                                                     │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

8 VACANT PROPERTIES (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties	N/hood	N/hood	City
All Household spaces		**1,473**	**293,876**
Vacant household spaces	43	2.91%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	3	0.20%	0.19%
Occupied	1427	96.88%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES
Commentary
Average vacancy rate
Housing Policy Implications
None

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood	**3,342**		
A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	458	13.70%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	361	10.80%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	2,523	75.49%	79.43%

B Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	2,319	69.39%	69.01%
Physical disability	278	8.32%	7.82%
Mental health condition	190	5.68%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	190	5.68%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	79	2.36%	2.49%
Learning disability	17	0.51%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	63	1.88%	2.14%
Development disorder	14	0.42%	0.64%

C Provision of Care in a household

1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	144	4.31%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	67	2.00%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	125	3.74%	2.88%

Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a
D household   251   9.92%   8.43%

9. HEALTH & DISABLITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

A Neighbourhood has higher levels of individuals whose physical movement is limited

B The above is reflected in in the higher proportion of persons with physical disabilities

C There is a higher proportion of the population dependent on unpaid care

D Neighbourhood has a higher proportion of its working age population with long term sickness or disability

Housing Policy Implications

Despite being a stable areas with no issues on the surface, there is evidence to suggest that medical and social support is and will be required for a higher proportion of resident households

CENSUS PROFILE SUMMARY	N/hood	City

ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census

A Neighbourhood Profiles)

Ethnic Origin	Frequency	N/hood	City
White British or Irish	2,954	88.39%	**84.56%**
White Other	56	1.67%	**3.87%**
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	3	0.09%	**0.48%**
Indian	76	2.27%	**1.46%**
Pakistani	80	2.39%	**3.78%**
Bangladeshi	0	0.00%	**0.08%**
Chinese	105	3.14%	**1.79%**
Other Asian	14	0.41%	**0.94%**
African, Caribbean or Black	41	1.22%	**2.40%**
Other ethnic group	13	0.39%	**0.64%**
	3,342		

B Country of Birth

Born outside UK	265	7.93%	**12.24%**

C Spoken English

Does not speak English well or at all	88	2.63%	**2.59%**

10. ETHNICITY

Commentary

A Neighbourhood has higher than average proportion of white British or Irish but a lower proportion of White Other ethnicities

B Smaller than average proportion of residents are born outwith the UK

C Proportion of residents who do not speak English is similar to city average   .

Housing Policy Implications

Encouraging migrants, asylum seekers and refugees to settle in the neighbourhood may further boost population

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	**66.07%**	64.49%
Economically inactive	**33.93%**	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	**10.87%**	9.05%
Full time students	**6.68%**	13.73%
Retired	**11.78%**	11.32%

12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or vans	**57.60%**	49.18%

Commentary

The Neighbourhood has slightly higher proportion of its population in employment, has a lower proportion of students living at home, a marginally higher proportion of retired persons under 74 years of age and above average 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

Blackhill & Hogganfield with RSL Stock

Legend

- RSL Stock
- Neighbourhood Boundary

Development and Regeneration Services
231 George Street
Glasgow G1 1RX

Executive Director
Richard Brown

0   125   250   500   750
Mtr