

RUCHAZIE & GARTHAMLOCK 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		1,765	5,203	966	7,934
	N/hood %		22.25%	65.58%	12.18%	
	cf city %		16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES		Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency		1,795	5,244	1,098	8,137
	N/hood %		22.06%	64.45%	13.49%	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

Commentary

Total population **increase** of 203 (2.55%)

Housing Policy Implications

The neighbourhood appears to be growing and continuing to be popular with households with families. There has been a slight rise in the proportion over 65s

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood **3,515**

GLASGOW'S HOUSING STRATEGY 2017 - 2022 : NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILES

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	874	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.11%	
Proportion of all households	24.86%	14.46%

B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILD	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	609	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.30%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	69.67%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%

C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,180	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.79%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	33.57%	22.96%

D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	520	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.07%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	14.79	16.96%

Single person households over 65 386 36,508

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

% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.06%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	10.98%	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	836	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	23.78%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

- The neighbourhood has a high proportion of lone parent families compared to the city average
- A** The proportion of lone parent families with dependent children remains higher than the city average
- B** The neighbourhood has some 10% more families with dependent children than the city average
- C** The neighbourhood has a lower than average proportion of single households over 65
- D** The neighbourhood has a lower proportion of single person households under 65 than the city average
- E**

Housing Policy Implications

In spite of evidence of population growth, this is largely because of the numbers of dependent children in the population, rather than in terms of the formation of new households and indeed smaller households under 65. The area requires to achieve a more balanced population.

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City				
Occupied by One person	1,222	34.76%	43.13%	135	29	15	4
Occupied by Two people	1,064	30.27%	30.35%				
Occupied by Three people	656	18.66%	13.71%				
Occupied by Four people	380	10.81%	8.41%				
Occupied by Five people	140	3.98%	3.16%				
Occupied by Six people	31	0.88%	0.73%				
Occupied by Seven people	16	0.45%	0.26%				
Occupied by Eight or more people	6	0.17%	0.16%				
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	3,515						

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

As anticipated at 2 above, a higher proportion of households comprise 3, 4 and 5 person households than the city average.

Housing Policy Implications

In order to provide improved balance there may be a need for the provision of smaller units of accommodation

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)	1,350	410	1,910			3,670
	36.78%	11.17%	52.04%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	1,305	300	1,875	12	23	3,515
	37.12%	8.53%	53.34%			
CITY						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimate: Stock Change Comparator 2009/2014)	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

The proportion of owner occupied properties has remained constant since 2011 ; the Private Rented Sector share of the market has also increased numerically.

Housing Policy Implications

At the time of the Census, there was a clear need to boost the supply of owner occupation, however, this has been difficult due to the prevailing economic conditions since 2008.

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	132	3.75%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	625	17.78%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	1,118	31.80%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	1,614	45.91%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	16	0.45%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	2	0.05%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	8	0.22%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	0	0.00%	630	0.22%
	3,515		285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

The level of detached properties is in line with the city average and the proportion of tenement properties is well below the city average. There is a higher proportion semi detached and terraced properties.

Housing Policy Implications

The area still contains a high proportion of tenemental stock despite being on the periphery of the city. There may be a case for the provision of more low density accommodation

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

A Average Household size

N/hood	City
2.24	2.02

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

	N/hood	City
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	2,275	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	2,163	95.07%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	89	3.91%
Over 1.5 persons per room	23	1.10%

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	3515	497	1178	1675	47.65	1263	577	16.41
Owned	1317	254	558	812	61.65	354	151	11.46
Private rented or living rent free	323	40	83	123	38.08	130	70	21.67
Social rented	1875	203	537	740	39.47	779	356	19.99
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

Household size is higher than the city average reflecting the higher child population in the

- A** neighbourhood
- B** Densities are slightly higher than the city average
There is less overcrowding than the city average
- C** and less underoccupation

Housing Policy Implications

None

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	N/hood	City	City
7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)				
Occupied household spaces		3,515		
Occupied household spaces with no central heating	175	4.98%	11,379	3.98%

7. HEATING TYPE

Commentary

There is a higher than average proportion of the stock still without central heating

Housing Policy Implications

Given the higher proportion of children in the neighbourhood there should be a focus on providing adequate and affordable heating in all properties

8 VACANT PROPERTIES (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties

	N/hood	N/hood	City
All Household spaces		3,559	293,876
Vacant household spaces	33	0.93%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	11	0.31%	0.19%
Occupied	3515	98.76%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES

Commentary

There appears to be no demand problem.
Existing stock appears popular

Housing Policy Implications

None

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood

7,934

A Long term health/disability in a household

	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	1,144	14.42%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	812	10.23%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	5,978	75.34%	79.43%

B Long term health condition in a household

	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	5,381	67.82%	69.01%
Physical disability	663	8.35%	7.82%
Mental health condition	541	6.82%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	456	5.75%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	191	2.40%	2.49%
Learning disability	53	0.66%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	173	2.18%	2.14%
Development disorder	59	0.74%	0.64%

C Provision of Care in a household

1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	300	3.78%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	201	2.53%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	299	3.77%	2.88%

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

	610	10.53%	8.43%
--	-----	--------	-------

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

Higher proportions of residents have limiting health

A conditions than the city average

Apart from a higher proportion of residents with a physical disability, the prevalence of serious health conditions remains at or around the city

B average

There are higher proportions of residents

C requiring unpaid care than the city average

There is a higher proportion of the working age population with a long term health issue than the

D city average

Housing Policy Implications

There is clearly a problem of mobility for a significant group in the population, most likely the elderly, but possibly a proportion of the working age population. Housing providers should consider identifying those requiring adaptations or other housing related support

	CENSUS PROFILE SUMMARY	N/hood	City
ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)			
A Ethnic Origin	Frequency		
White British or Irish	7,431	93.66%	84.56%
White Other	176	2.21%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	18	0.22%	0.48%
Indian	23	0.29%	1.46%
Pakistani	13	0.16%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	0	0.00%	0.08%
Chinese	55	0.69%	1.79%
Other Asian	16	0.20%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	194	2.44%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	8	0.10%	0.64%
	7,934		
B Country of Birth			
Born outside UK	451	5.68%	12.24%
C Spoken English			
Does not speak English well or at all	133	1.67%	2.59%

10. ETHNICITY

Commentary

White British or Irish account for the vast majority of the population with all other groups underrepresented apart from African, Caribbean or

A Black communities

A lower proportion of residents were born out with

B the UK than the city average

The proportion of residents who do not speak English

C well or at all is below the city average

Housing Policy Implications

The neighbourhood does not appear to be attracting a reasonable proportion of diverse ethnic settlers with the exception of one group. It is important to understand why one particular group has settled in the neighbourhood and what scope there is to diversity further.

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	60.81%	64.49%
Economically inactive	39.19%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	13.43%	9.05%
Full time students	7.61%	13.73%
Retired	12.38%	11.32%

12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or van	44.98%	49.18%

Commentary

The neighbourhood has a lower proportion of its population in employment and a low proportion of students living at home, a slightly higher proportion of retired persons under 74 years of age and significantly lower levels of car ownership

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

