

**TEMPLE & ANNIESLAND 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		1,840	8,521	2,132	<b>12,493</b>
	N/hood %		14.73	68.21	17.06	
	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		1,875	8,798	2,090	<b>12,763</b>
	N/hood %		14.69	68.93	16.37	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

**1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT**

**Commentary**

Total population **increase** of 270 (2%)

**Housing Policy Implications**

Increase likely to be accounted for through provision of new housing build during the 3 year period

**2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION**

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

**Total Households in neighbourhood** **6,493**

**A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS**

	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	838	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.03%	
Proportion of all households	12.91%	14.46%

GLASGOW'S HOUSING STRATEGY 2017 - 2022 : NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILES

<b>B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	485	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.83%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	57.88%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%

<b>C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	1,298	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.98%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	19.99%	22.96%

<b>D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	1,321	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.73%	
<b>Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s</b>	20.34%	16.96%
<b>Single person households over 65</b>	1035	36,508
(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbourhood)		
% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.83%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	15.94%	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

1,986

86,728

Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD

30.59%

30.35%

**2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION**

**Commentary**

N/hood has lower 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 lower proportion of households with

**C** dependent children than the city average

N/hood has a higher proportion of over 65s than the city

**D** average

N/hood has a similar proportion of under 65 single

**E** person households to the city average

**Housing Policy Implications**

The area appears stable and may be have a slightly higher propensity to attract and retain older households

### 3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	3021	46.53%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	1997	30.76%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	781	12.03%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	501	7.72%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	150	2.31%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	30	0.46%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	9	0.14%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	4	0.06%	0.16%
<b>ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES</b>	<b>6,493</b>		

### 3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

#### Commentary

Proportions of households by size are very close to city averages

#### Housing Policy Implications

None

### 4 HOUSING TENURE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	Owner Occupied	Private Rented	Social Rented	Shared ownership	Rent free	Total
NEIGHBOURHOOD						
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (2014)</b> (Housing Stock Estimates)	3,655	1,350	1,795			6,800
	53.75%	19.85%	26.39%			
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)</b>	3,708	949	1,716	40	80	6,493
	57.10%	14.61%	26.42%			

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**

Higher than average home ownership in the N/hood than the city, however total provision has dropped in 3 years

Increase in private rented sector, similar to city average  
Lower level of social rented in the N/hood than the city as a whole

**Housing Policy Implications**

Increase in private rented sector likely to reflect the 'buy to let' and 'owner-landlord' segments of the housing market

**5 HOUSE TYPE**

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>% of stock</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>% of stock</b>
<b>Detached</b>	47	0.72%	11,167	3.91%
<b>Semi detached</b>	1,041	16.03%	36,522	12.78%
<b>Terraced</b>	998	15.37%	33,423	11.70%
<b>Tenement</b>	4,382	67.49%	197,146	69.00%
<b>Conversion (within an original property)</b>	19	0.29%	5,540	1.90%
<b>Within a commercial building</b>	5	0.08%	1,017	0.35%
<b>Caravan/mobile structure</b>	1	0.02%	348	0.12%
<b>Shared dwelling</b>	0	0.00%	630	0.22%
	<b>6,493</b>		<b>285,793</b>	

**5. HOUSE TYPE**

**Commentary**

Higher numbers living in semi-detached and terraced properties than the city. There is a large proportion of four in a block properties which are technically classed as tenements.

**Housing Policy Implications**

None

**6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS**

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

**A Average Household size**

N/hood	City
1.91	2.02

**B Dwelling Occupancy Rates**

**As a proportion of households counted**

*Occupied Household count*

Up to 0.5 persons per room

Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room

Over 1.5 persons per room

	N/hood	City
	4,804	204,466
4,677	97.36%	95.56%
103	2.14%	2.52%
24	0.50%	0.95%
<b>4,804</b>		

**C Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy**

(Source: Census Table LC4106SC by Neighbourhood)

**NEIGHBOURHOOD**

All households

Owned

Private rented or living rent free

Social rented

	Occupancy rating +2 or more	Occupancy rating +1	Total Underoccupation	Underoccupied %	Occupancy rating 0	Occupancy rating -1 or less	Overcrowded %
All households	6493	2319	3436	52.92	2147	910	14.01
Owned	3748	1467	2345	62.57	1044	359	9.58
Private rented or living rent free	1029	283	361	35.08	443	225	21.86
Social rented	1716	569	730	42.54	660	326	18.99

**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 than

**A** city average

Higher than average proportion not sharing

**B** bedrooms

There is a lower level of overcrowding than the city average in all tenures. Under occupation is generally

**C** higher.

**Housing Policy Implications**

None

(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**

	N/hood	N/hood	City	City
Occupied household spaces		6,060		
<b>Occupied household spaces with no central heating</b>	257	4.24%	11,379	3.98%

**7. HEATING TYPE**

**Commentary**

Slightly higher proportions of households in the N/hood with no central heating compared to the city average

**Housing Policy Implications**

Higher rate of non centrally heated houses likely to be down to individual preference of owners

There is probably some scope for encouraging the take up of insulation grant in the private sector

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

*Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties*

	N/hood	N/hood	City
<b>All Household spaces</b>		<b>6,654</b>	<b>293,876</b>
Vacant household spaces	153	2.30%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	8	0.12%	0.19%
Occupied	6,493	97.58%	97.21%

**8. VACANCIES**

**Commentary**

Vacancy rate in N/hood is similar to city average

**Housing Policy Implications**

None

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

**Total Residents in neighbourhood**

**12,493**

**A Long term health/disability in a household**

	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	1,671	13.38%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	1,337	10.70%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	9,485	75.92%	79.43%



<b>B Long term health condition in a household</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
No condition	8,376	67.05%	69.01%
Physical disability	1,097	8.78%	7.82%
Mental health condition	748	5.99%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	972	7.78%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	371	2.97%	2.49%
Learning disability	72	0.58%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	250	2.00%	2.14%
Development disorder	92	0.74%	0.64%
<b>C Provision of Care in a household</b>			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	574	4.59%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	248	1.99%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	387	3.10%	2.88%
<b>D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household</b>	686	7.18%	8.43%

## 9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

### Commentary

**A** N/hood residents have poorer mobility than city average

N/hood residents have a mixture of long term health

**B** conditions, some more or less than the city average

N/hood residents affected likely to require slightly more

**C** household care

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

**D** whole

**Housing Policy Implications**

None

CENSUS  
PROFILE  
SUMMARY    **N/hood**    **City**

**ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS** (Source: Census

**A** Neighbourhood Profiles)

**Ethnic Origin**

Frequency

White British or Irish	11,284	90.32%	<b>84.56%</b>
White Other	357	2.86%	<b>3.87%</b>
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	63	0.50%	<b>0.48%</b>
Indian	158	1.26%	<b>1.46%</b>
Pakistani	157	1.26%	<b>3.78%</b>
Bangladeshi	5	0.04%	<b>0.08%</b>
Chinese	132	1.06%	<b>1.79%</b>
Other Asian	100	0.80%	<b>0.94%</b>
African, Caribbean or Black	182	1.46%	<b>2.40%</b>
Other ethnic group	55	0.44%	<b>0.64%</b>
	<b>12,493</b>		

**B** Country of Birth

Born outside UK	1,055	8.44%	<b>12.24%</b>
-----------------	-------	-------	---------------

**C** Spoken English

Does not speak English well or at all	185	1.48%	<b>2.59%</b>
---------------------------------------	-----	-------	--------------

**10. ETHNICITY**

**Commentary**

Higher proportion of White (British) and White (Scottish)

**A** 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**

Affordability of housing may be a barrier to in-  
 migration from ethnic groups on lower incomes

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

<b>11 Economic activity (All people aged 16 -74)</b>	<b>N/Hood %</b>	<b>City%</b>
Economically active	<b>67.57%</b>	64.49%
Economically inactive	<b>32.43%</b>	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	<b>6.72%</b>	9.05%
Full time students	<b>9.96%</b>	13.73%
Retired	<b>13.14%</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>56.87%</b>	49.18%

**Commentary**

The Neighbourhood has a higher 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 below the city average

