

NORTH MARYHILL & SUMMERSTON 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		2,250	8,751	1,715	12,716
	N/hood %		17.69	68.82	13.49	
	cf city %		16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES		Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency		2,334	8,936	1,847	13,117
	N/hood %		17.79	68.12	14.08	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

Commentary

Total population **increase** of 401 (3.15%)
 There has been a slight rise in the proportion of over 65s, but the numbers of children and working age population have also increased

Housing Policy Implications

The neighbourhood appears to be popular and showing signs of growth

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood **5,994**

GLASGOW'S HOUSING STRATEGY 2017 - 2022 : NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILES

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,010	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.44%	
Proportion of all households	16.85%	14.46%

B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILD	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	675	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.55%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	66.83%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%

C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,638	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.50%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	27.33%	22.96%

D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,012	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.09%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	16.88%	16.96%

Single person households over 65 720 36,508

(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbourhood)

% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.97%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	12.01%	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	1,710	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	28.53%	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 higher than the city average

N/hood has higher proportion of households with

C dependent children compared with the city average

N/hood has a similar proportion of over 65s to the

D city average

N/hood has slightly lower proportion of under 65

E single person households than the city average

Housing Policy Implications

In spite of its popularity , the area, or parts of it, appear to be lacking balance of population groups. This suggests the need for some review of ways in which population levels can be sustained e.g. by providing new homes for families with and encouraging newly forming households to settle

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency N/hood		City
Occupied by One person	2430	40.54%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	1809	30.18%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	887	14.80%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	667	11.13%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	154	2.57%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	36	0.60%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	9	0.15%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	2	0.03%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	5,994		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

Slightly higher proportion of three and four person households and slightly fewer one and two person households than city averages

Housing Policy Implications

Suggests that there may be scope to increase the supply of smaller accommodation

4 HOUSING TENURE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	Owner Occupied	Private Rented	Social Rented	Shared ownership	Rent free	Total
NEIGHBOURHOOD						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates)	3,077	801	2346			6,224
	49.44%	12.87%	37.69%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	3,083	540	2,311	33	27	5,994
	51.43%	9.01%	38.56%			
CITY						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimate:	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
 Increases in the number and proportion of residents living in private rented sector.

Housing Policy Implications
 There is scope to increase provision in all sectors to meet growing demand

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	359	5.99%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	909	15.17%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	850	14.18%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	3,825	63.81%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	36	0.60%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	7	0.12%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	3	0.05%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	5	0.08%	630	0.22%
	5,994		285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

Higher proportion of households living in semi detached and terraced properties than the city average. High number of tenements includes multi storey flats.

Housing Policy Implications

The provision of low density properties could attract more families to the neighbourhood

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	City
A Average Household size	2.08	2.02

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

	N/hood	City
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	4,199	204,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	4,079	97.14%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	85	2.02%
Over 1.5 persons per room	35	0.83%
	4,199	

C Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy

(Source: Census Table LC4106SC by Neighbourhood)

NEIGHBOURHOOD	All households	Occupancy rating +2 or more	Occupancy rating +1	Total Underoccupation	Underoccupied %	Occupancy rating 0	Occupancy rating -1 or less	Overcrowded %
All households	5994	1279	1840	3119	52.03	1984	891	14.86
Owned	3116	988	1051	2039	65.43	782	295	9.46
Private rented or living rent free	567	71	171	242	42.68	223	102	17.99
Social rented	2311	220	618	838	36.26	979	494	21.37
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

Slightly higher average household size than city

A average

Higher proportion of those not sharing bedrooms

B in the N/hood

Overcrowding is lower than the city average in all tenures. However there is evidence of

C underoccupation also in all sectors

Housing Policy Implications

The reasons for underoccupation need to be better understood given the apparent demand for larger family accommodation

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	N/hood	City	City
7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)				
Occupied household spaces		5,994		
Occupied household spaces with no central heating	278	4.64%	11,379	3.98%

7. HEATING TYPE

Commentary

Higher proportion of those with no central heating than the city average. There is also likely to be fuel poverty in the area

Housing Policy Implications

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		6,143	293,876
Vacant household spaces	147	2.39%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	2	0.03%	0.19%
Occupied	5,994	97.57%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES

Commentary

Vacancy rate in the N/hood is in line with the city average

Housing Policy Implications

None

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood **12,716**

A Long term health/disability in a household

N/hood	N/hood	City
1,609	12.65%	11.37%
1,222	9.61%	9.20%
9,885	77.74%	79.43%

Day to day activity limited a lot
 Day to day activity limited a little
 Day to day activity not limited

B Long term health condition in a household

N/hood	N/hood	City
8,818	69.35%	69.01%
928	7.30%	7.82%
777	6.11%	6.51%
773	6.08%	6.08%
264	2.08%	2.49%
78	0.61%	0.58%
230	1.81%	2.14%
85	0.67%	0.64%

No condition
 Physical disability
 Mental health condition
 Deafness or partial hearing loss
 Blindness of partial sight loss
 Learning disability
 Learning difficulty
 Development disorder

C Provision of Care in a household

1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	604	4.75%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	280	2.20%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	361	2.84%	2.88%

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

798	6.28%	8.43%
-----	-------	-------

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

N/hood residents have poorer mobility than city

A average

N/hood residents long term conditions are similar

B to the city average

N/hood residents affected likely to require slightly more household care compared to the

C city average

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

None

CENSUS
PROFILE
SUMMARY
N/hood City

ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census

A Neighbourhood Profiles)

Ethnic Origin

Frequency

Ethnic Origin	Frequency	N/hood	City
White British or Irish	11,426	89.86%	84.56%
White Other	297	2.34%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	50	0.39%	0.48%
Indian	150	1.18%	1.46%
Pakistani	137	1.08%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	6	0.05%	0.08%
Chinese	256	2.01%	1.79%
Other Asian	67	0.53%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	298	2.34%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	29	0.23%	0.64%
Total	12,716		

B Country of Birth

Born outside UK	1,063	8.36%	12.24%
-----------------	-------	-------	---------------

C Spoken English

Does not speak English well or at all	266	2.09%	2.59%
---------------------------------------	-----	-------	--------------

10. ETHNICITY

Commentary

Higher proportion of White (British) and White

A (Scottish) than city as a whole.

Lower number of those born outside UK living in the

B 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

11 Economic activity (All people aged 16 -74)	N/Hood %	City%
Economically active	66.30%	64.49%
Economically inactive	33.70%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	7.65%	9.05%
Full time students	10.57%	13.73%
Retired	11.85%	11.32%

12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or var	52.28%	49.18%

Commentary

The Neighbourhood has a slightly higher than city average proportion of its population in employment, but a lower proportion of domiciled students, an around average proportion of retired people under 74 and a slightly higher 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

