

MOUNT VERNON & EAST SHETTLESTON 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		1,395	6,475	2,434	10,304
	N/hood %		13.53	62.84	23.62	
	cf city %		16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES		Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency		1,318	6,276	2,465	10,059
	N/hood %		13.1	62.39	24.5	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT**Commentary**

Total population has decreased by 245 (-2.3%). The neighbourhood has a very high proportion of the over 65 age cohort, which is rising - nearly double the city average, whilst the proportion of children is falling. Working age population has remained relatively constant but is consistently below city averages.

Housing Policy Implications

The implication is that more of the population is likely to require some form of care, adapted accommodation or support. It may also be necessary to encourage provision of more family accommodation to create more balance in the community.

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood	4,862	
A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	573	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.38%	
Proportion of all households	11.78%	14.46%
B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	333	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.41%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	58.11%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%
C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,046	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.59%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	21.51%	22.96%
D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,366	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.82%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	28.09%	16.96%

Single person households over 65	887	36,508
---	-----	--------

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

% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.42%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	18.24%	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	1,010	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	20.77%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

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

There is a lower proportion of households with lone
B parents with dependent children than the city average
 Reflecting the demographics, there is a much lower
 proportion of households in the neighbourhood with
C dependent children than the city average

The neighbourhood has one of the highest
 representations in the city of single households over
 65 and has a much higher than average proportion of
 this household type compared to other household
D types within the neighbourhood

There is a much lower proportion of single people
 under 65 represented in the neighbourhood compared
E to the city average

Housing Policy Implications

As alluded to under population change by cohort, it is evident that there is a disproportionate weighting towards elderly households. This implies that housing needs in the neighbourhood are likely to be different from the norm. Furthermore, the fact that there is a smaller proportion of under 65 households and households with dependent children suggests that much of the housing stock is likely to be underoccupied or unaffordable for new households.

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	1,897	39.01%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	1,563	32.14%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	706	14.52%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	528	10.85%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	133	2.73%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	26	0.53%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	5	0.10%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	4	0.08%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	4,862		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

There is a lower proportion of one person households than the city average, however this may be due to the lower number of one person households under 65. There is, however higher occupancy by three and four person households than the city averages.

Housing Policy Implications

A breakdown of occupancy by tenure may shed light on the real level of underoccupation.

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)	3,259	518	1169			4,946
	65.89%	10.47%	23.63%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	3,293	326	1,191	10	42	4,862
	67.72%	6.70%	24.50%			
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

Social renting as a proportion of stock has not changed. Significantly, private renting has increased at the expense of owner occupation. However owner occupation continues to be the dominant tenure.

Housing Policy Implications

The growth in private renting may be temporary - assuming a recovery in house prices in the longer term for an area characterised as low density suburban with a traditionally high demand for owner occupation

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	654	13.45%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	1,483	30.70%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	815	16.76%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	1,831	37.65%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	60	1.23%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	6	0.12%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	11	0.22%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	2	0.04%	630	0.22%
	4,862		285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

The proportion of stock which is detached, semi detached and terraced is considerably higher than the city average accounting for over 50% of the total stock in the neighbourhood

Housing Policy Implications

There are no obvious policy implications

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

A Average Household size

N/hood	City
2.09	2.02

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

	N/hood	City
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	3,613	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	3,540 97.97%	96.5%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	53 1.47%	2.52%
Over 1.5 persons per room	20 0.55%	0.95%

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	4862	1482	1494	2976	61.21	1392	494	10.16
Owned	3303	1344	1117	2461	74.51	614	228	6.9
Private rented or living rent free	368	52	115	167	45.38	152	49	13.31
Social rented	1191	86	262	348	29.22	626	217	18.22

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 close to the city

A average

B Density per room is low

Overcrowding is around half the city average regardless of tenure. There are also high levels of

C underoccupancy relative to the city averages

Housing Policy Implications

The main implication is that a large proportion of what appears to be an ageing population is living in owner occupied low density housing, whose housing needs are largely satisfied at present. However, much of the stock which is family accommodation is being underoccupied, which means that families seeking accommodation may have to look elsewhere to find long term 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		5,382		
Occupied household spaces with no central heating	108	2.01%	11,379	3.98%

7. HEATING TYPE
Commentary
 A larger proportion of homes have central heating compared to the city average

Housing Policy Implications
 None

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		4,948	293,876
Vacant household spaces	84	1.70%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	2	0.04%	0.19%
Occupied	4862	98.26%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES
Commentary
 Vacancy rates are much lower than the city average

Housing Policy Implications
 None

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood	10,304		
A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	1,642	15.93%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	1,241	12.04%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	7,421	72.02%	79.43%
B Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	6,473	62.82%	69.01%
Physical disability	1,025	9.94%	7.82%
Mental health condition	599	5.81%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	949	9.21%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	342	3.32%	2.49%
Learning disability	71	0.69%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	158	1.53%	2.14%
Development disorder	54	0.52%	0.64%
C Provision of Care in a household			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	660	6.40%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	243	2.36%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	374	3.63%	2.88%
D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household	629	8.15%	8.43%

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

Neighbourhood has a higher proportion of
A residents whose day to day activities are limited

The proportion of the population with a long term health condition is higher in this neighbourhood than the city average, possibly accounted for by the high proportion of over 65s with the prevailing illnesses being age related (Physical
B disability, deafness, sight impairment)

A higher proportion of individuals need unpaid care than the city average across all three bands
C of unpaid care

There are nearly twice as many residents of working age who have a disability or long term
D health condition compared to the city average.

Housing Policy Implications

It is likely that more resources will be required to assist residents in this neighbourhood to continue to live as independently as possible. There is a case to be made for the increased provision of localised sheltered or supported accommodation.

	CENSUS PROFILE SUMMARY	N/hood	City
ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)			
A Ethnic Origin	Frequency		
White British or Irish	9,895	96.03%	84.56%
White Other	95	0.92%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	14	0.14%	0.48%
Indian	26	0.25%	1.46%
Pakistani	76	0.73%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	0	0.00%	0.08%
Chinese	70	0.68%	1.79%
Other Asian	19	0.18%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	79	0.76%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	30	0.29%	0.64%
	10,304		
B Country of Birth			
Born outside UK	363	3.22%	12.24%
C Spoken English			
Does not speak English well or at all	141	1.25%	2.59%

10. ETHNICITY

Commentary

The neighbourhood contains a very high proportion of

A British or Irish white residents

The proportion of residents born outside the UK is

B only a quarter of the city average

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 and the cost of housing.

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	63.54%	64.49%
Economically inactive	36.46%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	5.75%	9.05%
Full time students	7.52%	13.73%
Retired	18.97%	11.32%

12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or van	62.98%	49.18%

Commentary

The Neighbourhood has a marginally lower proportion of its population in employment, has a lower proportion of students living at home. However, the neighbourhood contains one of the highest proportions of retired persons under 74 years of age in the city. There is also a significantly higher level of car ownership

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

