

**HYNDLAND, DOWANHILL & PARTICK EAST 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	1,804	15,925	2,347	<b>20,076</b>
	N/hood %	8.98	79.32	11.69	
	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	1,897	16,122	2,560	<b>20,579</b>
	N/hood %	9.22	78.34	12.44	
	cf city %	16.13	69.94	13.93	

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

Total population **increase** of 503 (2.5%)

The proportion of children in households appears to be on the rise. There also appears to be a rise in the proportion of older households

**Housing Policy Implications**

The question is whether or not the housing stock available will meet the needs of these cohorts.

**2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION****Total Households in neighbourhood****10,765**

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

**LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS**

<b>A</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	534	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.29%	
Proportion of all households	4.96%	14.46%

**LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH**

<b>B</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
DEPENDENT CHILDREN		
In Neighbourhood	306	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.15%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	57.30%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%

**HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT**

<b>C</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
CHILDREN		
In Neighbourhood	1,330	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.03%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children in Neighbourhood	12.35%	22.96%

**HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS  
OVER 65 YEARS**

<b>D</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>	
In Neighbourhood	1,438	48,451	
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.97%		
<b>Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s</b>	13.36%	16.96%	
<b>Single person households over 65</b>	1090	36,508	(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbourhood)
% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.99%		
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	10.13%	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	3678	86,728	
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	34.17%	30.35%	

## 2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

### Commentary

- A** N/hood has lower than average proportion of lone parent households
- B** Proportion of lone parent households with dependent children is lower than the rest of the city
- C** N/hood has lower proportion of households with dependent children than the city average
- D** N/hood has a lower proportion single persons over 65s than the city average
- E** N/hood has a slightly higher proportion of under 65 single person households than the city average

### Housing Policy Implications

The neighbourhood is associated with a younger population. However, the neighbourhood also contains family households whose housing needs may be understated. A demand assessment of these groups and sub neighbourhoods is required to determine the extent of hidden housing need

### 3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	4768	44.29%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	3958	36.76%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	1262	11.72%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	578	5.36%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	147	1.36%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	31	0.28%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	13	0.12%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	8	0.07%	0.16%

#### ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES

**10,765**

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

### 3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

#### Commentary

N/hood has a higher proportion of one and two person households than the city average

#### Housing Policy Implications

The proportion of one person households is lower than might be expected but still slightly above the city average. This may be a reflection of the amount of choice available in terms of larger properties. Demand for 1 and 2 bedroom flats is likely to be high and growing regardless of tenure.

**4 HOUSING TENURE**

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	Owner Occupied	Private Rented	Social Rented	Shared ownership	Rent free	Total
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (2014)</b> (Housing Stock Estimates)	5,697	4,015	1532			11,244
	<b>50.66%</b>	<b>35.71%</b>	<b>13.62%</b>			
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)</b>	5,441	3,640	1,502	42	140	10,765
	<b>50.54%</b>	<b>33.81%</b>	<b>13.95%</b>			
CITY						
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (2014)</b> (Housing Stock Estimates)	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 level of home ownership has remained roughly the same in the N/hood, and is higher than the city average

Private rented sector is significantly higher than the city average

The proportion of social rented housing has remained relatively static

##### **Housing Policy Implications**

Demand for all tenures remains buoyant. Demand for private rented housing is likely to continue to be high and the slight fall in the proportion of owner occupation may reflect conversions of owner occupied properties to private rented properties following the credit crunch in 2008.

GLASGOW'S HOUSING STRATEGY 2017 - 2022 : NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILES

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

<b>HOUSE TYPE</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>% of stock</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>% of stock</b>
<b>5 Detached</b>	125	1.16%	11,167	3.91%
<b>Semi detached</b>	233	2.16%	36,522	12.78%
<b>Terraced</b>	426	3.96%	33,423	11.70%
<b>Tenement</b>	8,649	80.34%	197,146	69.00%
<b>Conversion (within an original property)</b>	1,251	11.62%	5,540	1.90%
<b>Within a commercial building</b>	36	0.33%	1,017	0.35%
<b>Caravan/mobile structure</b>	4	0.04%	348	0.12%
<b>Shared dwelling</b>	41	0.38%	630	0.22%
	<b>10,765</b>		<b>285,793</b>	



## **5. HOUSE TYPE**

### **Commentary**

Significantly higher proportion of tenemental properties and conversions within the N/hood, compared to the city average. Despite the neighbourhood including named settlements with lower density properties, the main concentration of flats are located in the Partick East and Hyndland communities, with Hyndland containing larger flats

### **Housing Policy Implications**

There may be a case for increasing the number of larger properties in the Partick East community. However, this may be difficult due to a lack of sites and the likely high cost of acquiring vacant sites

**UNDER AND OVER**

**6 OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS**

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
<b>A Average Household size</b>	1.85	2.02

**B Dwelling Occupancy Rates**

**As a proportion of households counted**

	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	7,923	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	7,813 98.61%	95.56%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	69 0.87%	2.52%
Over 1.5 persons per room	41 0.52%	0.95%

**Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy**

**C**

(Source: Census Table LC4106SC by Neighbourhood)

<b>NEIGHBOURHOOD</b>	All households	Occupancy rating +2 or more	Occupancy rating +1	Total U/occupation	U/occupied %	Occupancy rating 0	Occupancy rating -1 or less	Overcrowded %
All households	10765	2182	2916	5098	47.36	3921	1746	16.22
Owned	5483	1861	1774	3635	66.29	1477	371	6.77
Private rented or living rent free	3780	256	923	1179	31.19	1653	948	25.08
Social rented	1502	65	219	284	18.91	791	427	28.43
<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**

- A** Average household size is lower than the city average
- B** Higher than average proportion not sharing bedrooms
- C** Underoccupation is lower than the city average with the exception of owner occupied stock. Overcrowding is lower than the city average with the exception of social rented housing

**Housing Policy Implications**

The shortage of larger family housing appears to be in the social rented sector

(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**

	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>City</b>
Occupied household spaces		9,665		
<b>Occupied household spaces with no central heating</b>	523	5.41%	11,379	3.98%

## 7. HEATING TYPE

### Commentary

Those without central heating in the N/hood is higher than the city average

### Housing Policy Implications

Owner occupied and private rented sectors are less likely to have central heating and some form of energy efficiency measures installed. Ways of improving access to available grants should be explored

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

*Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties*

### All Household spaces

	N/hood	N/hood	City
		<b>11,041</b>	<b>293,876</b>
Vacant household spaces	217	1.97%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	59	0.53%	0.19%
Occupied	10,765	97.50%	97.21%

## 8. VACANCIES

### Commentary

Vacancy rate is lower than the city average

### Housing Policy Implications

None

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

<b>Total Residents in neighbourhood</b>			
	<b>20,176</b>		
<b>Long term health/disability in a household</b>			
<b>A</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
Day to day activity limited a lot	1,315	6.52%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	1,448	7.18%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	17,313	85.81%	79.43%
<b>Long term health condition in a household</b>			
<b>B</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
No condition	15,364	76.15%	69.01%
Physical disability	892	4.42%	7.82%
Mental health condition	968	4.80%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	910	4.51%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	349	1.73%	2.49%
Learning disability	53	0.26%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	377	1.87%	2.14%
Development disorder	77	0.38%	0.64%
<b>Provision of Care in a household</b>			
<b>C</b>			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care p/w	971	4.81%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care p/w	176	0.87%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care p/w	210	1.04%	2.88%
<b>Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household</b>			
<b>D</b>			
	548	2.72%	8.43%

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

N/hood residents have slightly

**A** better mobility than city average

N/hood residents have less long term health issues than city as a

**B** whole

N/hood residents affected more likely to require shorter term unpaid

**C** care

Lower proportion of long term sick and disabled in working age

**D** population

**Housing Policy Implications**

None

**ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS****A Ethnic Origin**

	Frequency	N/hood	City
White British or Irish	16,892	83.72%	<b>84.56%</b>
White Other	1,385	6.86%	<b>3.87%</b>
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	220	1.09%	<b>0.48%</b>
Indian	299	1.48%	<b>1.46%</b>
Pakistani	260	1.30%	<b>3.78%</b>
Bangladeshi	18	0.09%	<b>0.08%</b>
Chinese	499	2.49%	<b>1.79%</b>
Other Asian	172	0.86%	<b>0.94%</b>
African, Caribbean or Black	186	0.93%	<b>2.40%</b>
Other ethnic group	145	0.72%	<b>0.64%</b>
	<b>20,076</b>		

**Country of Birth**

<b>B</b>	Born outside UK	3,094	15.41%	<b>12.24%</b>
----------	-----------------	-------	--------	---------------

**Spoken English**

<b>C</b>	Does not speak English well or at all	245	1.22%	<b>2.59%</b>
----------	---------------------------------------	-----	-------	--------------

**10. ETHNICITY**

**Commentary**

**A** Proportion of White (British) and White (Scottish) similar to city average. Higher White (Other) representation and higher proportions of Chinese

**B** Larger proportion of those born outside UK living in the N/hood than the city average

**C** Lower proportion of non English speakers in N/hood compared to rest of city

**Housing Policy Implications**

The neighbourhood appears to be going through a transition to becoming a more ethnically diverse neighbourhood, bringing with it different challenges for housing providers

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

<b>Economic activity (All people aged 16 - 74)</b>		
	<b>N/Hood %</b>	<b>City%</b>
Economically active	<b>70.38%</b>	64.49%
Economically inactive	<b>29.62%</b>	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	<b>3.19%</b>	9.05%
Full time students	<b>22.63%</b>	13.73%
Retired	<b>8.96%</b>	11.32%
<b>12 Car Ownership</b>		
	<b>N/Hood</b>	<b>City</b>
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or vans	<b>57.89%</b>	49.18%

### Commentary

The N/hood has a higher % of its population in employment and one of the highest % of domiciled students, a lower % of retired people under 74 and higher levels of car ownership. There may be implications in terms of traffic pollution and parking issues, given the close proximity of the Dowanhill and Partick East communities to the University and nearby tourist attractions.

The % of residents who have never worked or are classified as long term sick is one of the lowest in the city



