

EASTERHOUSE 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			1,712	5,664	992	8,368
N/hood %			20.45	67.68	11.85	
cf city %			16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES		Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
Frequency			1,717	5,871	959	8,547
N/hood %			20.08	68.69	11.22	
cf city %			16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

Commentary
 Population has increased by 179

The proportion of the population which is of working age remains slightly below the city average, but the proportion of children is on average around 4 percentage points higher than the city average. Over 65s as a proportion of the population has fallen and is consistently below the city average

Housing Policy Implications

Demand for family accommodation is likely to continue. There is a question as to the extent to which current provision is adequately meeting the needs of the older age groups and the chronically sick and disabled

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood	3,853	
A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	956	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.31%	
Proportion of all households	24.81%	14.46%
B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	650	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.45%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	67.99%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%
C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,189	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.81%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children in City	30.85%	22.96%
D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	538	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.11%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	13.96%	16.96%

Single person households over 65 413 36,508

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

% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.13%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	10.72%	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	1046	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	27.14%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

Neighbourhood has one of the highest rates of lone parent hood in the city. Lone parents account for nearly a quarter of all households in the neighbourhood

- A** neighbourhood
- B** A higher proportion of all lone parent households have dependent children than the city average
- C** The neighbourhood contains a higher than average proportion of households with dependent children which may be reflected in the age cohort proportions under population change
- D** Neighbourhood has lower than city average single person households over 65
- E** Neighbourhood has less than city average singles under 65

Housing Policy Implications

When compared with more diverse neighbourhoods, the area does not appear to be attracting singles and childless couple households. Current focus would appear to be on meeting the housing needs of existing family households, however, there may be a case for improving the balance between age cohorts and household types.

Housing management focus is likely to be on managing existing tenancies, rather than in trying to bring in more varied household types.

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	1,459	37.87%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	1,172	30.42%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	699	18.14%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	345	8.95%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	129	3.35%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	32	0.83%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	8	0.21%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	9	0.23%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	3,853		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

Average households sizes are greater in this neighbourhood

One person households are well below the city average

Housing Policy Implications

Providing a larger supply of smaller dwellings may be beneficial in improving the population mix

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)	1,154	513	2522			4,189
	27.55%	12.24%	60.20%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	1,064	344	2,377	58	10	3,853
	27.61%	8.92%	61.69%			
CITY						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates	128,641	60,465	107,167	N/A	N/A	296,273
Stock Change Comparator 2009/2014)	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

Owner occupation is half of the city average, and remains static. The Private Rented Sector has expanded.

The proportion of social rented properties has also fallen although numbers appear to have increased

Housing Policy Implications

In order to boost population growth and attract new residents into the neighbourhood, consideration should be given to ways of providing diverse accommodation to meet existing needs and satisfying wider demand in the city

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	202	5.24%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	736	19.10%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	532	13.80%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	2,352	61.04%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	26	0.67%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	1	0.02%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	0	0.00%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	4	0.10%	630	0.22%
	3,853		285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

The neighbourhood remains overwhelmingly composed of tenemental stock, in spite of being on the edge of the city.

Housing Policy Implications

The lack of family accommodation with private garden space may be putting a brake on internal movement by existing family households and discouraging new households from seeking to move to the area.

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

A Average Household size

N/hood	City
2.14	2.02

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

	N/hood	City
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	2,583	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	2,460	95.23%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	90	3.48%
Over 1.5 persons per room	33	1.28%
	2,583	

C Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy ²

(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	3853	459	1269	1728	44.84	1355	770	19.98
Owned	1122	244	403	647	57.66	307	168	14.97
Private rented or living rent free	354	41	115	156	44.06	102	96	27.12
Social rented	2377	174	751	925	38.91	946	506	21.29
CITY								
All households	285693	53242	83843	137,085	47.98	98916	49692	17.39
Owned	130217	41005	43625	84,630	64.99	32838	12749	9.79
Private rented or living rent free	50665	4029	12217	16,246	32.07	21132	13287	26.23
Social rented	104811	8208	28001	36,209	34.54	44946	23656	22.57

6. OVERCROWDING AND UNDER OCCUPATION

Commentary

Average household size is broadly in line with the

A city average

B Occupancy is in line with city wide averages

There is less underoccupation than the city average. Levels of overcrowding are higher than

C the city average, except in the social rented sector

Housing Policy Implications

Given the relatively high proportion of children in the population, overcrowding in the private rented sector and the high density nature of the stock, is there scope to provide more family accommodation across all the tenures?

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	N/hood	City	City
7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)				
Occupied household spaces				
Occupied household spaces with no central heating	179	4.64%	11,379	3.98%

7. HEATING TYPE

Commentary

There is a higher proportion of the stock lacking central heating than the city average

Housing Policy Implications

The key question for housing managers is the extent to which the installed heating systems are being used and their affordability and any knock on impacts for tenants including ability to pay rent

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		3,951	293,876
Vacant household spaces	93	2.35%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	5	0.12%	0.19%
Occupied	3853	97.52%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES

Commentary

Vacancy rate is below city average

Housing Policy Implications

None

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood **8,368**

A Long term health/disability in a household

	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	1,483	17.72%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	940	11.23%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	5,945	71.09%	79.43%

B Long term health condition in a household

	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	5,362	64.07%	69.01%
Physical disability	832	9.94%	7.82%
Mental health condition	738	8.82%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	542	6.47%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	251	3.00%	2.49%
Learning disability	59	0.70%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	230	2.75%	2.14%
Development disorder	69	0.82%	0.64%

C Provision of Care in a household

1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	281	3.35%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	245	2.93%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	307	3.67%	2.88%

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

867	13.99%	8.43%
-----	--------	-------

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

Neighbourhood has higher than average proportions of residents whose day to day

A activities are limited

Reflecting the above, the neighbourhood has higher than average proportions of residents with

B significant health and disability issues

Residents requiring unpaid care tend to need

C more hours of care than the city average

There is high proportion of residents in the working age group who are long term sick or

D disabled

Housing Policy Implications

In this neighbourhood, there is a clear and growing demand for housing which is flexible in terms of allowing individuals to remain within the community who might otherwise require hospital or other specialist care. It is recommended that an assessment of current housing stock be undertaken in respect of its suitability to sustain independent living as far as possible and that care and other support arrangements are co-ordinated through the Health & Social Care Partnership

CENSUS PROFILE SUMMARY

Y N/hood City

ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census

A Neighbourhood Profiles)

Ethnic Origin

	Frequency		
White British or Irish	7,957	95.08%	84.56%
White Other	210	2.51%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	13	0.15%	0.48%
Indian	25	0.29%	1.46%
Pakistani	21	0.25%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	0	0.00%	0.08%
Chinese	43	0.51%	1.79%
Other Asian	16	0.19%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	79	0.94%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	4	0.05%	0.64%
	8,368		

B Country of Birth

Born outside UK	368	4.39%	12.24%
-----------------	-----	-------	---------------

C Spoken English

Does not speak English well or at all	145	1.73%	2.59%
---------------------------------------	-----	-------	--------------

10. ETHNICITY

Commentary

The Neighbourhood has one of the highest concentrations of white British or Irish in the city and

A very low representation from any other ethnic groups

Compared to the city average, a very low proportion

B of residents were born outwith the UK

The level of spoken English amongst ethnic groups is

C better than the city average

Housing Policy Implications

The neighbourhood does not appear to be attracting a reasonable proportion of diverse ethnic settlers, when compared to other neighbourhoods. This may reflect the distance to traditional areas of settlement or a lack of demand for the type and size of housing which is available in different tenures.

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	59.81%	64.49%
Economically inactive	40.19%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	13.70%	9.05%
Full time students	8.17%	13.73%
Retired	10.71%	11.32%

12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or van	40.04%	49.18%

Commentary

The Neighbourhood has a lower proportion of its population in employment, a low proportion of students living at home, a slightly 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 one of the highest in the city

