

**CALTON & BRIDGETON 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		1,954	12,817	1,989	<b>16,760</b>
	N/hood %		11.66	76.47	11.86	
	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		2,217	13,477	2,031	<b>17,725</b>
	N/hood %		12.51	76.03	11.46	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

**1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT**

**Commentary**

Population has **increased** dramatically (+ 1055 , over 6%), mainly as a result of a rising working age population. There is also a much higher proportion of children in the population reflecting family growth within the neighbourhood.

**Housing Policy Implications**

Demand for family housing within the area is likely to continue to grow.

## 2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

<b>Total Households in neighbourhood</b>	<b>8,936</b>	
<b>A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	1,127	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.73%	
Proportion of all households	12.62%	14.46%
<b>B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	741	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.79%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	65.74%	
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	1,410	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.15%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	15.77%	22.96%
<b>D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	1,289	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.66%	
<b>Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s</b>	14.42%	16.96%

<b>Single person households over 65</b>	1044	36,508
(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbourhood)		
% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.85%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	11.68%	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	3510	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	39.27%	30.35%

## 2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

### Commentary

Neighbourhood has lower proportion of lone parent **A** families than city average

The proportion of lone parent families with **B** dependent children is similar to the city average

The neighbourhood has a much lower proportion of households with dependent children, than the city average, in spite of the rise in the proportion of **C** children in the population

The neighbourhood has a lower proportion of single **D** person households over 65

The neighbourhood contains a larger proportion of the population who are single and within the **E** working age group

**Housing Policy Implications**

Whilst demand for smaller households is growing, it is likely that new demand for family housing may emerge otherwise those households wishing to have children may be forced to move elsewhere to have their housing needs met

**3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE**

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

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
Occupied by One person	4554	50.96%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	2830	31.67%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	966	10.81%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	412	4.61%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	123	1.38%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	30	0.33%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	13	0.14%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	8	0.09%	0.16%
<b>ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES</b>	<b>8,936</b>		

**3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE**

**Commentary**

One person households are currently the most prevalent in the neighbourhood, but two person households are also strongly represented

**Housing Policy Implications**

In order to encourage community balance and long term sustainability, consideration should be given to the provision of larger family accommodation in all tenures

**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> (Housing Stock Estimate)	2,331	2,700	4,275			9,306
	25.04%	29.01%	45.94%			
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)</b>	2,205	2,447	4,007	205	72	8,936
	24.67%	27.38%	44.84%			
CITY						
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (2014)</b> (Housing Stock Estimate)	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**

The private rented sector occupies a larger share of the market. There has been a slowdown in the growth of owner occupation and social renting remains the dominant tenure and has grown

**Housing Policy Implications**

There appears to be scope for further growth in the private housing sector

**5 HOUSE TYPE**

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>% of stock</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>% of stock</b>
<b>Detached</b>	55	0.61%	11,167	3.91%
<b>Semi detached</b>	184	2.05%	36,522	12.78%
<b>Terraced</b>	847	9.48%	33,423	11.70%
<b>Tenement</b>	7,631	85.39%	197,146	69.00%
<b>Conversion (within an original property)</b>	68	0.76%	5,540	1.90%
<b>Within a commercial building</b>	60	0.67%	1,017	0.35%
<b>Caravan/mobile structure</b>	65	0.72%	348	0.12%
<b>Shared dwelling</b>	26	0.29%	630	0.22%
	<b>8,936</b>		<b>285,793</b>	

**5. HOUSE TYPE**

**Commentary**

Neighbourhood is characterised as being essentially high density tenemental in spite of high levels of clearance and demolition in the area historically. There is an under-representation of low density family accommodation.

**Housing Policy Implications**

A decision is required as to whether to allow further high density dwellings to be added to the supply, or to risk encouraging lower density new build to encourage families to settle in the neighbourhood

**6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS**

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
<b>A Average Household size</b>	1.76	2.02

**B Dwelling Occupancy Rates**

**As a proportion of households counted**

	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	6,221	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	6,007	96.56%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	136	2.18%
Over 1.5 persons per room	78	1.25%

**C Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy**

(Source: Census Table LC4106SC by Neighbourhood)

<b>NEIGHBOURHOOD</b>	Occupancy rating +2 or more	Occupancy rating +1	Total Underoccupation	Underoccupied %	Occupancy rating 0	Occupancy rating -1 or less	Overcrowded %
All households	8936	2110	2753	30.8	3777	2406	26.92
Owned	2410	854	1132	46.97	881	397	16.47
Private rented or living rent free	2519	477	569	22.58	935	1015	40.29
Social rented	4007	779	1052	26.25	1961	994	24.81
<b>CITY</b>							
All households	285693	83843	137,085	47.98	98916	49692	17.39
Owned	130217	43625	84,630	64.99	32838	12749	9.79
Private rented or living rent free	50665	12217	16,246	32.07	21132	13287	26.23
Social rented	104811	28001	36,209	34.54	44946	23656	22.57

## **6. OVERCROWDING AND UNDER OCCUPATION**

### **Commentary**

The neighbourhood contains a high proportion of single person households reflecting the average household size which is much lower

**A** than the city average

Dwelling occupancy is close to the city average

**B** suggesting that properties fit households

In spite of this, there are higher levels of overcrowding in all tenures and

**C** correspondingly much less underoccupation.

### **Housing Policy Implications**

The neighbourhood has a reasonable balance of housing tenure which may make the area attractive in terms of choice. However the level of overcrowding, especially in the private rented sector gives cause for concern and must be addressed

Housing providers (including private landlords) may need to look for alternative ways of addressing growing demand and matching this with new supply in a variety of tenures and house sizes

Particular geographical areas within the neighbourhood are the target of ambitious regeneration projects



(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	N/hood	City	City
<b>7 HEATING TYPE</b> (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)				
Occupied household spaces		8,936		
<b>Occupied household spaces with no central heating</b>	503	5.63%	11,379	3.98%

**7. HEATING TYPE**

**Commentary**

Neighbourhood has a higher proportion of properties with no central heating

**Housing Policy Implications**

Specific locations of properties without central heating should be identified. It is likely that these properties will also require insulation and other heat efficiency measures. It is also likely that there will be a high level of fuel poverty

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

<i>Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties</i>	N/hood	N/hood	City
<b>All Household spaces</b>	9,328		<b>293,876</b>
Vacant household spaces	368	3.95%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	24	0.26%	0.19%
Occupied	8,936	95.82%	97.21%

**8. VACANCIES**

**Commentary**

There appear to be a higher proportion of void properties in this neighbourhood than might otherwise be expected, given its apparent demand

**Housing Policy Implications**

It is possible that in spite of a high proportion of good quality properties in the area, there may be pockets of low demand, unmaintained closes requiring attention and other underlying issues associated with quality of the

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

**Total Residents in neighbourhood** **16,760**

**A Long term health/disability in a household**

	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
Day to day activity limited a lot	2,458	14.67%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	1,621	9.67%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	12,681	75.66%	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	11,515	68.70%	69.01%
Physical disability	1,506	8.98%	7.82%
Mental health condition	1,314	7.84%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	977	5.83%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	404	2.41%	2.49%
Learning disability	99	0.59%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	406	2.42%	2.14%
Development disorder	68	0.40%	0.64%

<b>C Provision of Care in a household</b>			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	510	3.04%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	302	1.80%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	417	2.49%	2.88%

<b>Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household</b>	1,544	11.10%	8.43%
---	-------	--------	-------

## 9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

### Commentary

There is a high proportion of individuals with

**A** long term health issues

There is a higher than average incidence of residents with physical and mental health

**B** conditions

**C** There are relatively low levels of unpaid care

The proportion of the working age population with long term sickness or disability is higher **D** than the city average

**Housing Policy Implications**

The neighbourhood is in need of interventions both in terms of housing but also health care. The area gives the impression of being a magnet for new households, however, beneath the surface there are problems involving overcrowding and physical and mental well being of some residents.

CENSUS PROFILE SUMMARY **N/hood** **City**

**ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS** (Source: Census

**A** Neighbourhood Profiles)

**Ethnic Origin**

Frequency

White British or Irish	13,541	80.79%	<b>84.56%</b>
White Other	1,264	7.54%	<b>3.87%</b>
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	65	0.38%	<b>0.48%</b>
Indian	328	1.95%	<b>1.46%</b>
Pakistani	168	1.00%	<b>3.78%</b>
Bangladeshi	19	0.11%	<b>0.08%</b>
Chinese	435	2.59%	<b>1.79%</b>
Other Asian	192	1.14%	<b>0.94%</b>
African, Caribbean or Black	616	3.67%	<b>2.40%</b>
Other ethnic group	132	0.79%	<b>0.64%</b>
	<b>16,760</b>		

**B Country of Birth**

Born outside UK

2,997

17.88%

**12.24%**

**C Spoken English**

Does not speak English well or at all

431

2.57%

**2.59%**

**10. ETHNICITY**

**Commentary**

It is clear that this neighbourhood is much more diverse in relation to ethnicity than most neighbourhoods in the city, with the proportion of 'non white' and 'white other' being much more

**A** prevalent within households

This diversity is reflected in the much higher proportion of residents who were not born in the

**B** UK

The rate of English speaking is as good as if not

**C** better than the city average

**Housing Policy Implications**

Housing providers need to be aware that the area is attracting a more diverse range of households and that this may bring consequences in terms of understanding and communicating with residents who have particular housing needs to be addressed.

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

<b>11 Economic activity (All people aged 16 -74)</b>	<b>N/Hood %</b>	<b>City%</b>
Economically active	<b>59.08%</b>	64.49%
Economically inactive	<b>40.92%</b>	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	<b>10.03%</b>	9.05%
Full time students	<b>22.03%</b>	13.73%
Retired	<b>9.16%</b>	11.32%

  

<b>12 Car Ownership</b>	<b>N/Hood</b>	<b>City</b>
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or v	<b>34.84%</b>	49.18%

**Commentary**

The Neighbourhood has a lower proportion of its population in employment but has a very high proportion of students domiciled, a lower 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 marginally above the city average

