# KNIGHTSWOOD NEIGHBOURHOOD

# 1 POPULATION PROFILE 3-YEAR CHANGE

(Sources: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles and 2014 Population Estimates by Neighbourhood)

<b>2011 CENSUS</b>	Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency	2,996	10,654	3,505	17,155
	N/hood %	17.46	62.1	20.43	
	cf city %	16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES	Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency	2,851	10,680	3,329	16,860
	N/hood %	16.9	63.34	19.74	
	cf city %	16 13	69 94	13 93	

#### 1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

#### Commentary

Population **decrease** of 295 (1.7%). The biggest fall is in the older age group (-176)

#### **Housing Policy Implications**

No obvious issues

#### 2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood 8,134

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,308	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	3.17%	
Proportion of all households	16.08%	14.46%

LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT	

ט	CHILDREN	N/hood	City
	In Neighbourhood	769	26,513
	% of city total in this Neighbourhood As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in	2.90%	
	N/HOOD	58.79%	
	As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%
С	HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
	In Neighbourhood	2,025	65,612
	% of city total in this Neighbourhood	3.09%	
	As a percentage of Households with dependent children	24.90%	22.96%
D	HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
	In Neighbourhood	1 022	48,451
	iii Neighbourhood	1,922	10, 13 ±
	% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood Proportion of all households which contain only over	3.97%	10, 131
	% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood		16.96%
	% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood Proportion of all households which contain only over	3.97%	ŕ
	% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood Proportion of all households which contain only over	3.97%	·
	% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	3.97% 23.63% 1,393	16.96%
	% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s Single person households over 65	3.97% 23.63% 1,393	16.96%
	% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s  Single person households over 65 (Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Nei % of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	3.97% 23.63% 1,393 ghbourhood)	16.96%
	% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s  Single person households over 65  (Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Nei % of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood % of households single person over 65 as a proportion	3.97% 23.63% 1,393 ghbourhood) 3.82%	16.96% 36,508

E ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65	N/hood	City
(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by	Neighbourhood)	
ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65	2,034	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	25.01%	30.35%

#### 2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

# Commentary

N/hood has higher than average proportion of lone **A** parent households

Proportion of lone parent households with dependent **B** children is lower than city average

N/hood has higher proportion of households with **C** dependent children than city average

N/hood has a higher proportion of single over 65s than **D** the city average

N/hood has a lower proportion of under 65 single **E** person households

#### **Housing Policy Implications**

No obvious issues

#### **3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE**

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

Frequency	N/hood	City
3427	42.13%	43.13%
2367	29.10%	30.35%
1171	14.40%	13.71%
777	9.55%	8.41%
303	3.73%	3.16%
62	0.76%	0.73%
21	0.26%	0.26%
6	0.07%	0.16%
8,134		
	3427 2367 1171 777 303 62 21	2367 29.10% 1171 14.40% 777 9.55% 303 3.73% 62 0.76% 21 0.26% 6 0.07%

# **3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE**

# Commentary

The pattern of occupation is broadly in line with city averages

**Housing Policy Implications** 

None

# **4 HOUSING TENURE**

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	Owner Occupied	Private Rented	Social Rented	Shared ownershi p	Rent free	Total
NEIGHBOURHOOD  TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates)	4,246	850	3,159			8,255
	51.43%	10.30%	38.27%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	4,352	509	3,193	11	69	8,134
	53.50%	6.26%	39.25%			

TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates a	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

Higher levels of home ownership and social rented in the N/hood compared to the city average, but a substantial increase in the proportion of private rented properties in 3 years, probably as a result of the conversion of former right to buy properties to buy to let or single owner landlordism

# **Housing Policy Implications**

Further depletion of low density social rented stock is likely to result in displacement of families seeking social rented accommodation to other parts of the West

There may be a case for housing providers to consider building additional social rented accommodation on available sites

#### **5 HOUSE TYPE**

Detached
Semi detached
Terraced
Tenement
Conversion (within an original property)
Within a commercial building
Caravan/mobile structure
Shared dwelling

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
246	3.02%	11,167	3.91%
1,773	21.80%	36,522	12.78%
1,492	18.34%	33,423	11.70%
4,563	56.10%	197,146	69.00%
42	0.52%	5,540	1.90%
6	0.07%	1,017	0.35%
0	0.00%	348	0.12%
12	0.15%	630	0.22%
8,134		285,793	

# 5. HOUSE TYPE

#### Commentary

Higher levels of semi-detached and terraced family properties in the N/hood than the city average. Much of the tenemental stock is likely to take the form of multi storey flatted property and four in a block housing.

#### **Housing Policy Implications**

Any new build should reflect the range and type of accommodation required to meet assessed and projected housing need

# **6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS**

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

N/hood City 2.07 2.02

A Average Household size

# **B** Dwelling Occupancy Rates

# As a proportion of households counted

		N/ nooa	City
Occupied Household count		5,928	204,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	5,720	96.49%	95.56%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	165	2.78%	2.52%
Over 1.5 persons per room	43	0.73%	0.95%

5,928

C Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy 2	stimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy (Source: Census Table LC4106SC by Neighbourhood)							
		Occupanc						
	All	y rating	Occupanc	Total			Occupanc	
	household	+2 or	y rating	Underocc	Underocc	Occupanc	y rating -1	Overcrow
NEIGHBOURHOOD	S	more	+1	upation	upied %	y rating 0	or less	ded %
All households	8134	1579	3136	4715	57.97	2252	1167	14.35
Owned	4363	1254	1852	3106	71.19	906	351	8.04
Private rented or living rent free	578	79	179	258	44.63	218	102	17.64
Social rented	3193	246	1105	1351	42.31	1128	714	22.36
CITY								
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

Average household size in the N/hood is very

- **A** slightly higher than the city average Higher than average proportion not sharing
- **B** bedrooms

  Levels of overcrowding are lower than the city averages across the board. By contrast there is a significantly higher level of underoccupation across
- **C** all tenures

# **Housing Policy Implications**

The levels of underoccupation may be a reflection of the number of older households occupying family sized properties. There is a case for providing attractive smaller accommodation within the area which older residents may find easier to manage, especially older owner occupiers who may be finding it difficult to heat and maintain their existing properties.

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)	N/hood	N/hood	City	City
Occupied household spaces		8,134		
Occupied household spaces with no central heating	182	2.24%	11,379	3.98%

#### 7. HEATING TYPE

#### Commentary

Proportion of households without central heating lower than city average

# **Housing Policy Implications**

Analysis of hard to heat properties and levels of fuel poverty should be encouraged in all tenures

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

Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties	N/hood	N/hood	City
All Household spaces		8,261	293,876
Vacant household spaces	123	1.49%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	4	0.05%	0.19%
Occupied	8,134	98.46%	97.21%

# 8. VACANCIES

# Commentary

Vacancy rate is lower than city average

# **Housing Policy Implications**

None. Area appears to have good demand

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

Total Residents in neighbourhood	17,155
----------------------------------	--------

Α	Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
	Day to day activity limited a lot	2,899	16.90%	11.37%
	Day to day activity limited a little	1,994	11.62%	9.20%
	Day to day activity not limited	12,262	71.48%	79.43%
В	Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
	No condition	10,841	63.19%	69.01%
	Physical disability	1,815	10.58%	7.82%
	Mental health condition	1,266	7.38%	6.51%
	Deafness or partial hearing loss	1,507	8.78%	6.08%
	Blindness of partial sight loss	586	3.42%	2.49%
	Learning disability	137	0.80%	0.58%
	Learning difficulty	365	2.13%	2.14%
	Development disorder	141	0.82%	0.64%
C	Provision of Care in a household			
	1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	774	4.51%	4.29%
	20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	388	2.26%	1.92%
	50 or more hours unpaid care per week	781	4.55%	2.88%
_	Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a			
D	household	1,223	7.13%	8.43%

# 9. HEALTH & DISABLITY IN THE HOME Commentary

N/hood residents have poorer mobility than city

A average

N/hood residents have more long term health

**B** issues than city as a whole N/hood residents affected likely to require both

**C** short and long term unpaid care Lower proportion of long term sick and disabled in

**D** working age population

#### **Housing Policy Implications**

The general health of the population is poorer than city averages and comparable suburban residential neighbourhoods

The higher proportions of elderly people in the neighbourhood and the health conditions associated suggest the need to bring together housing and health/social care specialists to work more intensively with clients to improve their ability to remain in their homes for longer periods of time to avoid hospitalisation and longer house vacancy periods

		CENSUS		
	ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census	PROFILE		
Α	Neighbourhood Profiles)	SUMMARY	N/hood	City
	Ethnic Origin	Frequency		
	White British or Irish	15,314	89.27%	84.56%
	White Other	459	2.68%	3.87%
	Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	50	0.29%	0.48%
	Indian	113	0.66%	1.46%
	Pakistani	242	1.41%	3.78%
	Bangladeshi	8	0.05%	0.08%
	Chinese	123	0.72%	1.79%
	Other Asian	146	0.85%	0.94%
	African, Caribbean or Black	612	3.57%	2.40%
	Other ethnic group	88	0.51%	0.64%
		17,155		
В	Country of Birth			
	Born outside UK	1,527	8.90%	12.24%
C	Spoken English			
	Does not speak English well or at all	428	2.49%	2.59%

# **10. ETHNICITY**

#### Commentary

Higher proportion of White (British) and White (Scottish) than city as a whole. Slightly higher proportion of African, Caribbean or Black residents than

**A** the city

Lower proportion of residents born outside UK living in

**B** the N/hood than the city average

Lower proportion of non English speakers in N/hood

**C** compared to rest of city

#### **Housing Policy Implications**

Neighbourhood appears to be less attractive to ethnic minority communities. Providers should consider marketing of properties for a wider diversity of ethnic groups

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

49.18%

11 Economic activity (All people aged 16 -74)	N/Hood %	City%
Economically active	61.51%	64.49%
Economically inactive	38.49%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	10.43%	9.05%
Full time students	7.82%	13.73%
Retired	15.38%	11.32%
12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City

#### Commentary

The Neighbourhood has a lower than city average proportion of its population in employment, has a lower proportion of students living at home, a higher proportion of retired people under 74 and an above average level of car ownership.

From a housing affordability perspective, those residents who have never worked or are long term unemployed is above the city average

Proportion of Households with one or more cars or vans 51.61%

