

RUCHILL & POSSILPARK 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		2,055	7,451	1,457	10,963
	N/hood %		18.74	67.96	13.29	
	cf city %		16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES		Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency		2,045	7,385	1,495	10,925
	N/hood %		18.72	67.59	13.68	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

Commentary

Total population decrease of 38

No change to proportions of the three age cohorts

Housing Policy Implications

Lack of population growth could be the result of lack of new build or very low turnover of properties.

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood **5,466**

GLASGOW'S HOUSING STRATEGY 2017 - 2022 : NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILES

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,148	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.78%	
Proportion of all households	21.00%	14.46%

B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILD	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	751	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.83%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	65.42%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%

C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,440	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.19%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	26.34%	22.96%

D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	801	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.65%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	14.65%	16.96%

Single person households over 65 656 36,508

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

% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.80%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	12.00%	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	1,857	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	33.97%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

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

- Proportion of lone parent households with dependent children is just above city average
- B**

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

- N/hood has a similar proportion of over 65s to the city average
- D**

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

Housing Policy Implications

No obvious issues

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	2513	45.98%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	1548	28.32%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	797	14.58%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	417	7.63%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	149	2.73%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	32	0.59%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	7	0.13%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	3	0.05%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	5,466		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

Higher proportion of one and three person households in the N/hood than city average

Housing Policy Implications

The smaller proportion of family households may be the result of depopulation and clearance of housing stock over a number of years

For population to grow, there needs to be an increase in supply especially of family housing

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)	1,251	634	3,457			5,342
	23.42%	11.87%	64.71%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	1,257	549	3,596	29	35	5,466
CITY						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimate: Stock Change Comparator 2009/2014)	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

Much higher proportion of N/hood living in social rented properties than city average
 Low proportion of home ownership and private rented in the N/hood

Housing Policy Implications

The lack of any increase in supply in any tenure is of concern considering the number of large vacant sites within the neighbourhood. For the population to grow, these sites should be developed to meet a range of internal and external housing need

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	155	2.84%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	824	15.08%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	506	9.26%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	3,916	71.64%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	31	0.57%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	24	0.44%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	1	0.02%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	9	0.16%	630	0.22%
	5,466		285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

Slightly higher proportion of N/hood living in semi-detached and tenemental properties

However this may be confined to one or two pockets of lower density blocks (Four in a blocks are classified as tenements)

Housing Policy Implications

The area would benefit from an increase in supply of lower to medium density housing, which may encourage in-migration of larger households

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	City
A Average Household size	1.95	2.02

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

	N/hood	City
Occupied Household count	3,855	204,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	3,683	95.54%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	122	3.16%
Over 1.5 persons per room	42	1.09%
	3,847	

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	5466	561	1624	2185	39.97	2211	1070	19.57
Owned	1286	284	522	806	62.67	346	134	10.42
Private rented or living rent free	584	55	185	240	41.09	228	116	19.86
Social rented	3596	222	917	1139	31.67	1637	820	22.8
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

Lower average household size in the N/hood

A than city average

People sharing bedrooms is in line with city

B average

The level of overcrowding is below city average, other than in owner occupied households. Under occupation is below city average other than in
C the private rented sector

Housing Policy Implications

There is a need to bring average household size up to city average at least which means providing more family sized 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		5,468		
Occupied household spaces with no central heating	143	2.62%	11,379	3.98%

7. HEATING TYPE

Commentary

Lower proportion of those living with no central heating system in the N/hood than the city

Housing Policy Implications

In spite of the likely high level of heating provision, residents in this area are likely to be living in fuel poverty. Some investigation is required into the use of heating systems and the reliance on other forms of heating and/or incidence of pre payment meters

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		5,507	293,876
Vacant household spaces	37	0.67%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	4	0.07%	0.19%
Occupied	5,466	99.26%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES

Commentary

Vacancy rates lower in the N/hood than the city

Housing Policy Implications

Current local demand appears to be satisfied. There has been no significant demolition in recent years

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood **10,963**

A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	1,995	18.20%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	1,201	10.96%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	7,767	70.85%	79.43%

B Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	6,992	63.78%	69.01%
Physical disability	1,179	10.75%	7.82%
Mental health condition	1,087	9.92%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	738	6.73%	6.08%
Blindness or partial sight loss	297	2.71%	2.49%
Learning disability	83	0.76%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	281	2.56%	2.14%
Development disorder	72	0.66%	0.64%

C Provision of Care in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	347	3.17%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	224	2.04%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	360	3.28%	2.88%

Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household	1,173	14.22%	8.43%
---	--------------	---------------	--------------

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

N/hood residents have poorer mobility than city

A average

N/hood residents have a higher proportion of

B long term health conditions than the city average

N/hood residents affected likely to require more

C household care

Significantly higher proportion of long term sick and disabled in working age population in the D N/hood than the city average

Housing Policy Implications

Local providers should work with health and social care professionals to provide enhanced support for carers, and make homes more accessible in terms of mobility, particularly residents requiring to be discharged from hospital

CENSUS
PROFILE
SUMMAR
Y N/hood City

ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census

A Neighbourhood Profiles)

Ethnic Origin

	Frequency	N/hood	City
White British or Irish	9,453	86.23%	84.56%
White Other	342	3.12%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	32	0.29%	0.48%
Indian	81	0.74%	1.46%
Pakistani	150	1.37%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	2	0.02%	0.08%
Chinese	355	3.24%	1.79%
Other Asian	58	0.53%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	421	3.84%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	69	0.63%	0.64%
	10,963		

B Country of Birth

Born outside UK	1,216	11.09%	12.24%
-----------------	-------	--------	---------------

C Spoken English

Does not speak English well or at all	372	3.39%	2.59%
---------------------------------------	-----	-------	--------------

10. ETHNICITY

Commentary

Higher proportion of White (British) and White

A (Scottish) than city as a whole.

Slightly lower number of those born outside UK living

B in the N/hood than the city average

Higher proportion of non English speakers in N/hood

C compared to rest of city

Housing Policy Implications

There is a slightly higher proportion of non-white groups in the neighbourhood than comparable neighbourhoods which suggests that there is some further scope for population growth coming from recent settlers in the city

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	58.69%	64.49%
Economically inactive	41.31%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	15.03%	9.05%
Full time students	9.79%	13.73%
Retired	10.96%	11.32%

12 Car Ownership

Proportion of Households with one or more cars or vans

N/Hood	City
35.85%	49.18%

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 slightly lower proportion of retired people under 74 and a below average level of car ownership.

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

