

YOKER & SCOTSTOUN 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		2,444	8,269	1,247	11,960
	N/hood %		20.43	69.14	10.43	
	cf city %		16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES		Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency		2,326	8,244	1,276	11,846
	N/hood %		19.63	69.59	10.77	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT**Commentary**Total population **decrease** of 305 (-2.5%)

Most of the fall in proportions accounted for by smaller child population, even although this remains above the city average

Housing Policy Implications

There appears to have been little or no new housing development in the neighbourhood, although new development is severely limited by the proportion of industrial land between the river and the existing residential areas

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood	5,794
--	--------------

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	923	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.23%	
Proportion of all households	15.93%	14.46%
B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	640	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.41%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	69.34%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%
C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	640	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.98%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	11.05%	22.96%
D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	755	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.56%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	13.03%	16.96%

Single person households over 65	555	36,508
(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbourhood)		
% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.52%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	9.58%	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	1,957	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	33.78%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

- N/hood has a higher than average proportion of lone parent households
A
- Proportion of lone parent households with dependent children is above the city average
B
- N/hood has lower proportion of households with dependent children than the city average
C
- N/hood has a lower proportion of over 65s than the city average
D
- N/hood has a higher proportion of under 65 single person households
E

Housing Policy Implications

The fact that the neighbourhood has a higher proportion of singles under 65 suggests that the area may be attractive to newly forming households. There may be scope to expand housing provision

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	2512	43.36%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	1657	28.60%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	793	13.69%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	543	9.37%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	210	3.62%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	60	1.04%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	14	0.24%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	5	0.09%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	5,794		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

Household size 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 ownership	Rent free	Total
NEIGHBOURHOOD						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates)	2,291	892	2,520			5,703
	40.17%	15.64%	44.18%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	2,436	598	2,704	16	40	5,794
	42.04%	10.32%	46.67%			
CITY						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates)	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

Increase in proportion of N/hood living in the private rented sector. Fall in proportion of social rented housing. Higher than city average of those living in social rented

Housing Policy Implications

The lack of any growth in owner occupation is of concern

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	65	1.12%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	323	5.57%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	1,038	17.92%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	4,297	74.16%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	21	0.36%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	8	0.14%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	7	0.12%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	35	0.60%	630	0.22%
	5,794		285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

Majority of households living in tenemental and terraced properties, higher than the city average, but likely to include four in a block which are classified as tenements. There is also a substantial supply of multi storey flatted property, especially in the Scotstoun section of the neighbourhood

Housing Policy Implications

Demand for social rented housing should be reviewed

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	City
A Average Household size	2.06	2.02

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

	N/hood	City
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	4,109	204,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	3,928	95.60%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	127	3.09%
Over 1.5 persons per room	54	1.31%
	4,109	

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	5794	1078	1811	2889	49.86	1901	1004	17.33
Owned	2452	865	869	1734	70.72	545	173	7.05
Private rented or living rent free	638	42	184	226	35.42	275	137	21.47
Social rented	2704	171	758	929	34.36	1081	694	25.66
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

Higher average household size in the N/hood is in

A line with the city average

A higher proportion of households are sharing

B bedrooms

There is slightly higher overcrowding in the social rented sector compared with the city average.

Underoccupation is higher than the city average

C except in the social rented sector

Housing Policy Implications

There is a need for the provision of larger dwellings in the social rented sector

(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
	5,794		
129	2.23%	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 high proportion of central heating systems, there is likely to be considerable fuel poverty especially in the mid and western ends of the neighbourhood

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		5,953	293,876
Vacant household spaces	150	2.52%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	9	0.15%	0.19%
Occupied	5,794	97.33%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES

Commentary

Vacancy rate in N/hood is similar to city average

Housing Policy Implications

None. There does not appear to be a problem of over-supply. However it does not follow that all house types are popular

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood **11,960**

A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	1,278	10.69%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	1,194	9.98%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	9,488	79.33%	79.43%

B Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	8,485	70.94%	69.01%
Physical disability	775	6.48%	7.82%
Mental health condition	787	6.58%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	622	5.20%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	238	1.99%	2.49%
Learning disability	67	0.56%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	262	2.19%	2.14%
Development disorder	82	0.69%	0.64%
C Provision of Care in a household			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	505	4.22%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	235	1.96%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	306	2.56%	2.88%
Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household	817	9.15%	8.43%

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

- A** N/hood residents have similar mobility than city average
N/hood residents generally have less of long term health
- B** conditions than the city average
N/hood residents affected likely to require less
- C** household care
Slightly higher 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

Health is generally similar to the city as a whole. However, there may be more ill health in particular communities within the neighbourhood. Further research is required as to the extent of support required in these communities

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

ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census**A** Neighbourhood Profiles)**Ethnic Origin**

Frequency

White British or Irish	9,669	80.84%	84.56%
White Other	625	5.23%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	70	0.59%	0.48%
Indian	115	0.96%	1.46%
Pakistani	265	2.22%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	2	0.02%	0.08%
Chinese	191	1.60%	1.79%
Other Asian	254	2.12%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	627	5.24%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	142	1.19%	0.64%
	11,960		

B Country of Birth

Born outside UK	1,840	15.38%	12.24%
-----------------	-------	--------	---------------

C Spoken English

Does not speak English well or at all	443	3.70%	2.59%
---------------------------------------	-----	-------	--------------

10. ETHNICITY

Commentary

Higher proportion of African, Caribbean or Black and non-

A British White than the city average

Higher number of those born outside UK living in the

B N/hood than the city average

Higher proportion of non English speakers in N/hood

C compared to rest of city

Housing Policy Implications

The settlement pattern suggests that there are already established ethnic communities, though these may be confined to particular localities (for example asylum seeking families given leave to remain who were originally housed in multi storey blocks). There may be a requirement to provide larger family accommodation in the neighbourhood

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	67.95%	64.49%
Economically inactive	32.05%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	10.68%	9.05%
Full time students	10.31%	13.73%
Retired	8.77%	11.32%

12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or vans	49.75%	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 lower proportion of retired people under 74 and an 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

