DENNISTOUN 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	992	7,641	1,073	9,706
	N/hood %	10.22	78.72	11.05	
	cf city %	16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES	Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency	1,170	7,695	1,035	9,900
	N/hood %	11.81	77.72	10.45	
	cf city %	16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

Commentary

Population has increased by 194

There has been a reduction in the proportion of over 65s, and the working age population is proportionately higher than the city average

Housing Policy Implications

The neighbourhood appears to be attractive to new working age households, and there is some growth in households with children

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood

5,243

Α	LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
	In Neighbourhood	454	41,315
	% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.10%	
	Proportion of all households	8.66%	14.46%
В	LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
	In Neighbourhood	262	26,513
	% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.99%	
	As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	57.70%	
	As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households	37.70%	C 4 4 70/
	As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent nouserious		64.17%
C	HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
_	In Neighbourhood	704	65,612
	% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.07%	03,012
	As a percentage of Households with dependent children	13.42%	22.96%
		1311270	22.3070
D	HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
	In Neighbourhood	642	48,451
	% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.32%	
	Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	12.24%	16.96%
	Single person households over 65	502	36,508
	(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbor	urhood)	
	% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.37%	
	% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all		
	households	9.57%	12.78%

E ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65	N/hood	City
(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbo	urhood)	
ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65	1817	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	34.65%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

Neighbourhood has a much lower proportion of lone parent **A** households than city average

There is also a lower proportion of lone parent households **B** with dependent children

The neighbourhood has a lower proportion of households **C** with dependent children

The neighbourhood does not appear to have a **D** disproportionately large single elderly population

Conversely the neighbourhood is characterised by a higher **E** than average proportion of single working age households

Housing Policy Implications

The current population and household profile may reflect the area as being attractive to younger more mobile households, suggesting that the housing stock needs to be flexible

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	N/hood	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	2319	44.23%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	2006	38.26%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	559	10.66%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	261	4.98%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	76	1.45%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	14	0.26%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	4	0.07%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	4	0.07%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	5,243		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

One and two person households account for over 80% of the household size groups

Housing Policy Implications

Demand appears to be high for small household accommodation but there is a question as to whether or not, more balance to meet larger household needs should be aimed for

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)	2,362	2,094	885		5,341
	44.22%	39.21%	16.56%		

TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	2,366	1,846	931	34	66	5,243
	45.12%	35.20%	17.75%			
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

There has been a marked increase in the growth of the private rented sector, apparently at the expense of owner occupation, whilst social renting has also fallen

Housing Policy Implications

The growth in private renting may be temporary, however, it is likely that some intervention is possible in terms of ensuring a balance of provision especially in affordable housing

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated) N/hood % of stock City % of stock

	N/1100a	% OI SLOCK	City	% OI SLUCI
Detached	20	0.38%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	35	0.66%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	111	2.11%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	4,975	94.88%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	88	1.67%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	12	0.22%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	0	0.00%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	2	0.04%	630	0.22%
	5,243		285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

Neighbourhood has possibly the highest proportion of its stock which is classed as tenemental. This could be a function of its tight geographical boundaries and lack of potential sites for lower density development

Housing Policy Implications

Is there any scope to increase the supply of lower density accommodation for older people and families? If not, what are the implications for rehousing those who cannot find the accommodation they need in the area?

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	City
Average Household size	1.83	2.02

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

Α

As a proportion of households counted

		N/hood	City
Occupied Household count		3,796	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	3,693	97.28%	96.5.%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	74	1.95%	2.52%
Over 1.5 persons per room	29	0.76%	0.95%

C Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy **2**

(Source: Census Table LC4106SC by Neighbourhood)

	Occupanc						
	y rating		Total			Occupancy	
All	+2 or	Occupancy	Underoccu	Underocc	Occupanc	rating -1	Overcrowde
households	more	rating +1	pation	upied %	y rating 0	or less	d %
5243	508	1687	2195	41.86	2104	944	18
2400	314	935	1249	52.04	857	294	12.25
1912	109	525	634	33.16	861	417	21.81
931	85	227	312	33.51	386	233	25.02
285693	53242	83843	137,085	47.98	98916	49692	17.39
130217	41005	43625	84,630	64.99	32838	12749	9.79
50665	4029	12217	16,246	32.07	21132	13287	26.23
104811	8208	28001	36,209	34.54	44946	23656	22.57

6. OVERCROWDING AND UNDER OCCUPATION Commentary

Lower than average household size compared to city

A average

NEIGHBOURHOODAll households

Private rented or living rent free

Private rented or living rent free

Owned

CITY

Owned

Social rented

All households

Social rented

B Similar densities to city averages

Underoccupation is generally lower than city average with a greater propensity for overcrowding in the

C owner occupied and social rented sectors

Housing Policy Implications

The apparent levels of overcrowding may a cause for concern in such an already high density neighbourhood. It would be prudent to conduct surveys to determine the real extent of this overcrowding

N/hood	N/hood	City	City
274	5 23%	11 379	3 98%

(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

7. HEATING TYPE

Commentary

Below average proportion of properties with central heating systems

Housing Policy Implications

Given the preponderance of pre-1919 tenements in the neighbourhood, attention should be focussed on ways of improving insulation to this property type, in addition to encouraging the installation of central heating

8 VACANT PROPERTIES (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties	N/hood	N/hood	City
All Household spaces	5372		293,876
Vacant household spaces	122	2.27%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	7	0.13%	0.19%
Occupied	5243	97.59%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES

Commentary

Vacancy rate is similar to the city average, but higher than might have been expected

Housing Policy Implications

Suggests some demand an/or management issues perhaps confined to particular blocks or streets

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood 9,706

A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	898	9.25%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	790	8.14%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	8,018	82.61%	79.43%
B Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	7,195	74.12%	69.01%
Physical disability	536	5.52%	7.82%
Mental health condition	584	6.01%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	423	4.36%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	172	1.77%	2.49%
Learning disability	32	0.33%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	226	2.33%	2.14%
Development disorder	44	0.45%	0.64%
C Provision of Care in a household			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	375	3.86%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	136	1.40%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	191	1.96%	2.88%
Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a D household	429	5.24%	8.43%

9. HEALTH & DISABLITY IN THE HOME Commentary

A Higher than city average propensity to live independently Better than city average proportion of population not having

B severe illness or impairment

C Less propensity for residents to require carer support Lower proportion of long term sick or disabled in

D population

Housing Policy Implications

There are no significant housing policy implications although it is likely that a proportion of residents may require internal and external adaptations. However this needs to be assessed at a local level

ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census A Neighbourhood Profiles) Ethnic Origin	CENSUS PROFILE SUMMARY	N/hood	City
White British or Irish	8,086	83.31%	84.56%
White Other	551	5.68%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	55	0.57%	0.48%
Indian	179	1.84%	1.46%
Pakistani	165	1.70%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	14	0.14%	0.08%
Chinese	211	2.17%	1.79%
Other Asian	93	0.96%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	249	2.56%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	103	1.06%	0.64%
	9,706		

B Country of Birth

Born outside UK 1,482 15.26% **12.24%**

C Spoken English

Does not speak English well or at all 216 2.22% 2.59%

10. ETHNICITY COMMENTARY

Commentary

White British an Irish population reflects city average, however there is a slightly higher 'white other' population and some sign that other ethnic groups may be increasing

- A relative to the rest of the city
 - A higher than average proportion of the population was born
- **B** outside the UK than is the case for the city as a whole The level of spoken English is as good as if not slightly better
- **C** than the city average

Housing Policy Implications

No policy implications

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	71.96%	64.49%
Economically inactive	28.08%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	5.36%	9.05%
Full time students	19.18%	13.73%
Retired	8.13%	11.32%
12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or vans	45.14%	49.18%

Commentary

The Neighbourhood has a lower proportion of its population in employment but has a high proportion of students domiciled, a lower proportion of retired persons under 74 years of age and lower levels of car ownership From a housing affordability perspective, those residents who have never worked or are long term unemployed is well below the city average

