

MARYHILL ROAD CORRIDOR 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		1,489	11,666	1,686	14,841
	N/hood %		10.03	78.6	11.36	
	cf city %		16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES		Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency		890	14,609	1,377	16,876
	N/hood %		5.27	86.57	8.16	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

Commentary

Total population **increase** of 2035 (13.7%) - one of the highest in the city

Significant increase in working age population, but also a significant reduction in the proportions of children and older people suggesting that the area is attracting newly forming households at a faster rate than any other part of the city

Housing Policy Implications

Over time, there could be increasing demand for family accommodation in the area. Any re-development plans for vacant existing sites should include provision for family low density accommodation.

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood	7,642	
A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	748	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.81%	
Proportion of all households	9.79%	14.46%
B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHIL	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	509	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.92%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	68.05%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%
C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	968	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.48%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	12.67%	22.96%
D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,030	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.13%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	13.48%	16.96%

Single person households over 65	862	36,508
(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbourhood)		
% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.36%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	11.28%	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	3147	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	41.18%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

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

Proportion of lone parent households with
B dependent children is higher than the city average

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

N/hood has a lower proportion of over 65s than the
D city average

N/hood has higher proportion of under 65 single
E person households than the city average

Housing Policy Implications

None

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	4009	52.46%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	2304	30.15%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	837	10.95%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	338	4.42%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	112	1.47%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	32	0.42%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	5	0.07%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	5	0.07%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	7,642		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

N/hood has a much higher proportion of single person households than the city average

Housing Policy Implications

The area has a shortage of 4 - 6+ person accommodation which will need to be addressed

4 HOUSING TENURE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

NEIGHBOURHOOD	Owner Occupied	Private Rented	Social Rented	Shared ownership	Rent free	Total
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimate:	2,759	1,909	3,593			8,261
	33.40%	23.10%	43.49%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	2,583	1,618	3,298	41	102	7,642
	33.80%	21.17%	43.16%			

CITY

TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimat	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

Lower than average home ownership but higher than average social rented.

Private renting levels above the city average

Housing Policy Implications

Most growth in population appears to be coming from the Private Rented Sector, however there is probably scope for more owner occupation.

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	58	0.76%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	127	1.66%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	338	4.42%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	6,835	89.44%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	222	2.90%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	17	0.22%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	5	0.07%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	40	0.52%	630	0.22%
	7,642		285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

Much higher proportion of N/hood residents living in tenemental properties than the city average. A significant proportion will be in multi storey form.

Housing Policy Implications

The neighbourhood could benefit from a boost to the numbers of low density family properties available

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

A Average Household size

N/hood	City
1.74	2.02

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

	N/hood	City
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	5,714	204,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	5,589	95.56%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	97	2.52%
Over 1.5 persons per room	28	0.95%
	5,714	

C Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy ²

(Source: Census Table LC4106SC by Neighbourhood)

NEIGHBOURHOOD

All households
Owned
Private rented or living rent free
Social rented

All households	Occupancy rating +2 or more	Occupancy rating +1	Total Underoccupation	Underoccupied %	Occupancy rating 0	Occupancy rating -1 or less	Overcrowded %
7642	783	2010	2793	36.55	3293	1556	20.36
2624	565	898	1463	55.75	878	283	10.78
1720	93	430	523	30.41	807	390	22.67
3298	125	682	807	24.47	1608	883	26.77

CITY

All households
Owned
Private rented or living rent free
Social rented

285693	53242	83843	137085	47.98	98916	49692	17.39
130217	41005	43625	84630	64.99	32838	12749	9.79
50665	4029	12217	16246	32.07	21132	13287	26.23
104811	8208	28001	36209	34.54	44946	23656	22.57

6. OVERCROWDING AND UNDER OCCUPATION

Commentary

- A** Lower average household size than city average
Higher proportion of those not sharing
- B** bedrooms than the city average
There is overcrowding above the city average in the owner occupier and social rented sectors. However there is less evidence of
- C** underoccupancy.

Housing Policy Implications

There is a need to identify which specific properties are overcrowded and to assess ways of addressing the issue

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	N/hood	City	City
7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)				
Occupied household spaces		5,061		
Occupied household spaces with no central heating	469	9.27%	11,379	3.98%

7. HEATING TYPE

Commentary

Much higher proportion of those without central heating in the N/hood than the city average

Housing Policy Implications

In addition to a lack of central heating, parts of the neighbourhood will be subject to fuel poverty. Providers should work together to identify where there is a particular problem of fuel poverty and consider ways of addressing the consequences from a housing perspective

8 VACANT PROPERTIES (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

<i>Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties</i>	N/hood	N/hood	City
All Household spaces		7,898	293,876
Vacant household spaces	241	3.05%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	15	0.19%	0.19%
Occupied	7,642	96.76%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES

Commentary

Vacancy rate is higher than the city average average

Housing Policy Implications

Given the rise in population, it is likely that there remain pockets of low demand housing which should be reviewed by providers

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood

14,841

A Long term health/disability in a household

	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	1,712	11.54%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	1,322	8.91%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	11,807	79.56%	79.43%

B Long term health condition in a household

	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	10,527	70.93%	69.01%
Physical disability	998	6.72%	7.82%
Mental health condition	1,142	7.69%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	756	5.09%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	359	2.42%	2.49%
Learning disability	70	0.47%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	392	2.64%	2.14%
Development disorder	81	0.55%	0.64%

C Provision of Care in a household

1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	525	3.54%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	209	1.41%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	261	1.76%	2.88%

D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household

917	6.18%	8.43%
-----	-------	-------

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

N/hood residents have poorer mobility in

A relation to the city average

There is a higher incidence of mental health

B issues compared to the city average

N/hood residents affected likely to require less

C household care overall

Lower proportion of long term sick and disabled in working age population in the N/hood as the

D city as a whole

Housing Policy Implications

There is a 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 PROFILE SUMMARY	N/hood	City
ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census)			
A Neighbourhood Profiles)			
Ethnic Origin	Frequency		
White British or Irish	12,140	81.80%	84.56%
White Other	1,067	7.19%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	158	1.06%	0.48%
Indian	151	1.02%	1.46%
Pakistani	244	1.64%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	3	0.02%	0.08%
Chinese	350	2.36%	1.79%
Other Asian	141	0.95%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	500	3.37%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	87	0.59%	0.64%
	14,841		
B Country of Birth			
Born outside UK	2,423	16.33%	12.24%
C Spoken English			
Does not speak English well or at all	328	2.21%	2.59%

10. ETHNICITY

Commentary

Higher proportion of non-British White residents in the N/hood, as well as slightly higher proportions of

A other ethnicities

Higher number of those born outside UK living in the

B N/hood than the city average

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

Housing Policy Implications

None

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	63.35%	64.49%
Economically inactive	36.65%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	7.56%	9.05%
Full time students	25.62%	13.73%
Retired	8.29%	11.32%

12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or vans	42.82%	49.18%

Commentary

The Neighbourhood has a very slightly lower than city average proportion of its population in employment. However it does have one of the highest proportions of domiciled students in the city (over a quarter of the population), a lower proportion of retired people under 74 but a below average level of car ownership.

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

