

**HILLHEAD & WOODLANDS 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		1,852	16,350	1,563	<b>19,765</b>
	N/hood %		9.37	82.72	7.91	
	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		2,229	16,863	1,678	<b>20,770</b>
	N/hood %		10.73	81.18	8.08	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

**1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT****Commentary**

Total population **increase** by just over 1,000 (5%)

Increases in child and older populations

**Housing Policy Implications**

Clearly a high demand and growing area in the heart of the West End. Can supply actually meet demand in terms of available sites? What tenures should be promoted?

## 2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

<b>Total Households in neighbourhood</b>	<b>9,546</b>	
<b>A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	661	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.60%	
Proportion of all households	6.92%	14.46%
<b>LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH</b>		
<b>B DEPENDENT CHILDREN</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	409	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.54%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	61.88%	
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	1,199	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.83%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children in Neighbourhood	12.56%	22.96%

<b>D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 Y</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	1,003	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.07%	
<b>Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s</b>	10.51%	16.96%
<b>Single person households over 65</b>	844	36,508
(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbourhood)		
% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.31%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	8.84%	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	3101	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	32.48%	30.35%

**2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION**

**Commentary**

N/hood has lower than average proportion of

**A** lone parent households

Proportion of lone parent households with dependent children is lower than the rest of

**B** the city

N/hood has lower proportion of households

**C** with dependent children than the city average

N/hood has a lower proportion single person

**D** over 65s than the city average

N/hood has a slightly higher proportion of under 65 single person households than the

**E** city average

**Housing Policy Implications**

None

**3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE**

Occupied by One person

3945

41.33%

43.13%

Occupied by Two people

3158

33.08%

30.35%

Occupied by Three people

1343

14.07%

13.71%

Occupied by Four people

693

7.26%

8.41%

Occupied by Five people

288

3.02%

3.16%

Occupied by Six people

71

0.74%

0.73%

Occupied by Seven people

33

0.35%

0.26%

Occupied by Eight or more people

15

0.16%

0.16%

**ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES**

**9,546**

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

**3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE**  
**Commentary**  
 Two and three person households are slighter higher than the city average  
**Housing Policy Implications**  
 None

**4 HOUSING TENURE**

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

NEIGHBOURHOOD	Owner Occupied	Private Rented	Social Rented	Shared ownership	Rent free	Total
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (2014)</b> (Housing Stock Estimates)	3,600 <b>35.79%</b>	3,809 <b>37.87%</b>	2,649 <b>26.33%</b>			10,058
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)</b>	3,205 <b>33.57%</b>	3,611 <b>37.83%</b>	2,470 <b>25.87%</b>	133 1.39%	127 1.33%	9,546
<b>CITY</b>						
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (2014)</b> (Housing Stock Estimates)	128,641 <b>43.40%</b>	60,465 <b>20.40%</b>	107,167 <b>36.39%</b>			296,273
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)</b>	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**  
 Slight rise in home ownership and the social rented sector in the N/hood  
**Housing Policy Implications**  
 None

## 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>	64	0.67%	11,167	3.91%
<b>Semi detached</b>	88	0.92%	36,522	12.78%
<b>Terraced</b>	324	3.39%	33,423	11.70%
<b>Tenement</b>	8,264	86.57%	197,146	69.00%
<b>Conversion (within an original property)</b>	702	7.35%	5,540	1.90%
<b>Within a commercial building</b>	51	0.53%	1,017	0.35%
<b>Caravan/mobile structure</b>	2	0.02%	348	0.12%
<b>Shared dwelling</b>	51	0.53%	630	0.22%
	<b>9,546</b>		<b>285,793</b>	

### 5. HOUSE TYPE

#### Commentary

Proportion of those living in tenements is significantly higher than the city average  
 Proportion of conversions in the N/hood higher than city average

#### Housing Policy Implications

Key issues are likely to be the impact on neighbourhood quality (e.g. refuse disposal, car parking) arising from conversion, shared living and higher densities and in developing management solutions

**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>	2.02	2.02

**B Dwelling Occupancy Rates** **As a proportion of households counted**

	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	6,500	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	6,224	95.56%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	177	2.72%
Over 1.5 persons per room	99	1.52%
	<b>6,500</b>	

**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 U/occupation	U/occupied %	Occupancy rating 0	Occupancy rating -1 or less	Overcrowded %	
All households	9546	1108	2279	3387	35.48	3935	2224	23.3
Owned	3338	767	1121	1888	56.56	1014	436	13.06
Private rented or living rent free	3738	226	722	948	25.36	1655	1135	30.36
Social rented	2470	115	436	551	22.3	1266	653	26.44
<b>CITY</b>								
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**

The average household size in the N/hood

**A** is the same as the city

Similar to average proportion not sharing

**B** bedrooms

Overcrowding is higher than the city average across the board, whilst

**C** underoccupation is lower

**Housing Policy Implications**

accommodation. However it is difficult to see where available land will come from.

Land prices are likely to be unaffordable for RSLs, therefore, encouraging attractive affordable accommodation elsewhere in the city may be the only way to relieve pressure.

**HEATING TYPE** (Source: Census

**7** Neighbourhood Profiles)

Occupied household spaces

**Occupied household spaces with no central heating**

N/hood	N/hood	City	City
	9,546		
558	5.85%	11,379	3.98%



**7. HEATING TYPE**

**Commentary**

The proportion of properties without central heating in the N/hood is higher than the city average

**Housing Policy Implications**

A more concerted effort to increase thermal insulation is required, particularly in the private sector

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

*Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties*

	N/hood	N/hood	City
<b>All Household spaces</b>		9,801	<b>293,876</b>
Vacant household spaces	219	2.23%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	36	0.37%	0.19%
Occupied	9,546	97.40%	97.21%

**8. VACANCIES**

**Commentary**

The vacancy rate is close to the city average

**Housing Policy Implications**

There is likely to be high turnover in this neighbourhood, however, there may be empty properties which are not being fully utilised

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

<b>Total Residents in neighbourhood</b>	<b>19,765</b>		
<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	1,447	7.32%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	1,436	7.27%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	16,882	85.41%	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	15,199	76.90%	69.01%
Physical disability	901	4.56%	7.82%
Mental health condition	1,070	5.41%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	688	3.48%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	369	1.87%	2.49%
Learning disability	85	0.43%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	603	3.05%	2.14%
Development disorder	102	0.52%	0.64%
<b>C Provision of Care in a household</b>			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	683	3.46%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	223	1.13%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	268	1.36%	2.88%
<b>D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household</b>	<b>768</b>	<b>3.89%</b>	<b>8.43%</b>

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

**Commentary**

N/hood residents have slightly better

**A** mobility than city average

N/hood residents have slightly less long

**B** term health issues than city as a whole

N/hood residents affected more likely to

**C** require shorter term unpaid care

Lower proportion of long term sick and

**D** disabled in working age population

**Housing Policy Implications**

None

**ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS** (Source:

**A** Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

**Ethnic Origin**

White British or Irish

White Other

Mixed or multiple ethnic groups

Indian

Pakistani

Bangladeshi

Chinese

Other Asian

African, Caribbean or Black

Other ethnic group

	Frequency	N/hood	City
White British or Irish	13,775	69.69%	<b>84.56%</b>
White Other	1,554	7.86%	<b>3.87%</b>
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	223	1.13%	<b>0.48%</b>
Indian	533	2.70%	<b>1.46%</b>
Pakistani	1,382	6.99%	<b>3.78%</b>
Bangladeshi	48	0.24%	<b>0.08%</b>
Chinese	1,088	5.50%	<b>1.79%</b>
Other Asian	363	1.84%	<b>0.94%</b>
African, Caribbean or Black	431	2.18%	<b>2.40%</b>
Other ethnic group	368	1.86%	<b>0.64%</b>
	<b>19,765</b>		

**B Country of Birth**

Born outside UK	4,853	24.55%	<b>12.24%</b>
-----------------	-------	--------	---------------

**C Spoken English**

Does not speak English well or at all	860	4.35%	<b>2.59%</b>
---------------------------------------	-----	-------	--------------

**10. ETHNICITY**

**Commentary**

Higher proportion of Pakistani and Chinese

**A** residents than city average

Much higher proportions of those born outside

**B** the UK living in the N/hood

Higher proportion in the N/hood of residents

**C** who cannot speak English well or at all

**Housing Policy Implications**

The whole neighbourhood is regarded as cosmopolitan, reflecting the student population and the historical settlement of mainly Asian ethnic groups. The housing needs of these groups should be explored further.

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

<b>11 Economic activity (All people aged 16 -74)</b>	<b>N/Hood %</b>	<b>City%</b>
Economically active	<b>59.47%</b>	64.49%
Economically inactive	<b>40.52%</b>	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	<b>6.66%</b>	9.05%
Full time students	<b>37.35%</b>	13.73%
Retired	<b>5.85%</b>	11.32%

**12 Car Ownership**

Proportion of Households with one or more car

**N/Hood****43.44%****City**

49.18%

**Commentary**

The Neighbourhood has much higher proportion of its population in employment and a high proportion of domiciled students (around one third of the population), a lower proportion of retired people under 74 and significantly higher levels of car ownership.

From a housing affordability perspective, the proportion of residents who have never worked or are long term unemployed is one of the lowest in the city at around one third of the city average

