### YORKHILL & ANDERSTON NEIGHBOURHOOD

#### 1 POPULATION PROFILE 3-YEAR CHANGE

(Sources: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles and 2014 Population Estimates by Neighbourhood)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 - 64</td>
<td>9,170</td>
<td>9,894</td>
<td>86.59</td>
<td>85.99</td>
<td>70.03</td>
<td>69.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>13.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL POP</td>
<td>10,589</td>
<td>11,505</td>
<td>99.98</td>
<td>99.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commentary

Total population increase of 916 (8.6%) one of the faster in the city. Increase in the absolute numbers of working age households but also numerical increases in children and over 65s.

#### Housing Policy Implications

Demand for housing by newly forming households may be outstripping supply or resulting in the rising cost of housing.

---

### 2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood: 5,215
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N/hood</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Neighbourhood</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>41,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of city total in this Neighbourhood</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of all households</td>
<td>6.42%</td>
<td>14.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Neighbourhood</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>26,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of city total in this Neighbourhood</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD</td>
<td>62.39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households</td>
<td></td>
<td>64.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Neighbourhood</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>65,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of city total in Neighbourhood</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a percentage of Households with dependent children</td>
<td>11.64%</td>
<td>22.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Neighbourhood</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>48,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s</td>
<td>7.09%</td>
<td>16.96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

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

Housing Policy Implications
The neighbourhood appears to be in very high demand, which means that there may be pressure on available sites.
3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>N/hood City</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied by One person</td>
<td>2520</td>
<td>48.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied by Two people</td>
<td>1783</td>
<td>34.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied by Three people</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>10.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied by Four people</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>4.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied by Five people</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>2.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied by Six people</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied by Seven people</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied by Eight or more people</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES</td>
<td>5,215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary
Higher proportion of single and two person households compared to city average

Housing Policy Implications
Given the locus of the neighbourhood, demand for smaller accommodation will be higher than city average, but can supply match demand?

4 HOUSING TENURE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Occupied</th>
<th>Private Rented</th>
<th>Social Rented</th>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>Rent free</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEIGHBOURHOOD TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates)</td>
<td>1,699</td>
<td>2,307</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.61%</td>
<td>41.56%</td>
<td>27.82%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>2,205</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.89%</td>
<td>42.28%</td>
<td>25.75%</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
<td>1.48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates as of 2014)</th>
<th>128,641</th>
<th>60,465</th>
<th>107,167</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>296,273</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stock Change Comparator 2009/2014</td>
<td>43.40%</td>
<td>20.40%</td>
<td>36.39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)</td>
<td>128,436</td>
<td>48,019</td>
<td>104,811</td>
<td>1,781</td>
<td>2,646</td>
<td>285,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.95%</td>
<td>16.80%</td>
<td>36.68%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. HOUSING TENURE CHANGE

**Commentary**

- High proportion of households living in private rented sector in the N/hood compared to the city
- Slight increase in social rented sector

The proportion of private rented housing may be creating pressures on the existing housing stock e.g. in terms of communal maintenance; management of neighbour relations, multiple occupancy and rent levels

**Housing Policy Implications**

Demand across all tenures is likely to be high and growing

It is likely that supply will need to be increased or demand exported to other parts of the city
5  HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSE TYPE</th>
<th>N/hood</th>
<th>% of stock</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>% of stock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi detached</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>11,167</td>
<td>3.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
<td>36,522</td>
<td>12.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenement</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>33,423</td>
<td>11.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion (within an original property)</td>
<td>5,033</td>
<td>96.51%</td>
<td>197,146</td>
<td>69.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within a commercial building</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>5,540</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravan/mobile structure</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared dwelling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,215</strong></td>
<td><strong>285,793</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary
Most of the N/hood living in tenemental properties, much higher than the city as a whole

Housing Policy Implications
Likely increase in car ownership and competing demand for off street parking, creating issues for existing residents

6  UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

A  Average Household size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N/hood</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GLASGOW'S HOUSING STRATEGY 2017 - 2022: NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILES

#### B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupied Household count</th>
<th>N/hood</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 0.5 persons per room</td>
<td>3,635</td>
<td>96.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1.5 persons per room</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy**: 3,758

(Source: Census Table LC4106SC by Neighbourhood)

#### C NEIGHBOURHOOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All households</th>
<th>Occupancy rating +2 or more</th>
<th>Occupancy rating +1</th>
<th>Total Underoccupation</th>
<th>Underoccupied %</th>
<th>Occupancy rating 0</th>
<th>Occupancy rating -1 or less</th>
<th>Overcrowded %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All households</td>
<td>5215</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>1308</td>
<td>1674</td>
<td>32.09</td>
<td>2298</td>
<td>1243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private rented or living rent free</td>
<td>2282</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>27.56</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social rented</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All households</th>
<th>Occupancy rating +2 or more</th>
<th>Occupancy rating +1</th>
<th>Total Underoccupation</th>
<th>Underoccupied %</th>
<th>Occupancy rating 0</th>
<th>Occupancy rating -1 or less</th>
<th>Overcrowded %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All households</td>
<td>285693</td>
<td>53242</td>
<td>83843</td>
<td>137085</td>
<td>47.98</td>
<td>98916</td>
<td>49692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>130217</td>
<td>41005</td>
<td>43625</td>
<td>84630</td>
<td>64.99</td>
<td>32838</td>
<td>12749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private rented or living rent free</td>
<td>50665</td>
<td>4029</td>
<td>12217</td>
<td>16246</td>
<td>32.07</td>
<td>21132</td>
<td>13287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social rented</td>
<td>104811</td>
<td>8208</td>
<td>28001</td>
<td>36209</td>
<td>34.54</td>
<td>44946</td>
<td>23656</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. OVERCROWDING AND UNDER OCCUPATION

Commentary

Lower average household size in the N/hood than city average

A Proportion of households not sharing bedrooms is similar to city average

However, there is overcrowding in all three tenures above the city average and much lower levels of underoccupation, which may explain the anomaly

Housing Policy Implications

There is particular problem of overcrowding in the neighbourhood which can only be addressed by providing affordable accommodation within the neighbourhood or by individuals and families moving to other parts of the city

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEATING TYPE</th>
<th>N/hood</th>
<th>N/hood</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied household spaces</td>
<td>5,215</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,379</td>
<td>3.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied household spaces with no central heating</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>6.04%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. HEATING TYPE
Commentary
Higher proportion of those living with no central heating system in the N/hood than the city

Housing Policy Implications
It would be useful to identify where central heating systems have not been installed and to identify properties with poor thermal insulation with a view to encouraging energy saving measures

VACANT PROPERTIES (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

8 Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Household spaces</th>
<th>N/hood</th>
<th>N/hood</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacant household spaces</td>
<td>5,482</td>
<td>293,876</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second residence/holiday home</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>4.38%</td>
<td>2.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5215</td>
<td>95.13%</td>
<td>97.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. VACANCIES
Commentary
Vacancy rate in N/hood is higher than city average probably due to higher rates of turnover in the private sector

Housing Policy Implications
In spite of very high demand, the proportion of vacant properties is higher than might have been expected. This could be a product of short stay lets or properties being unaffordable to rent or buy
9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood 10,589

A Long term health/disability in a household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day to day activity limited a lot</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>11.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day to day activity limited a little</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>9.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day to day activity not limited</td>
<td>9,341</td>
<td>79.43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B Long term health condition in a household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No condition</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>69.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical disability</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>7.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health condition</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>6.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deafness or partial hearing loss</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>6.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blindness of partial sight loss</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning disability</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning difficulty</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development disorder</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C Provision of Care in a household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Care provision</th>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>4.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or more hours unpaid care per week</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long term sick or disabled</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>8.43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary
N/hood residents have much better mobility than city average

A
N/hood residents have less long term health issues than city as a whole

B
N/hood residents affected are likely to require shorter term unpaid care
Lower proportion of long term sick and disabled in working age population

Housing Policy Implications
None

ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>N/hood</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British or Irish</td>
<td>7,025</td>
<td>66.34%</td>
<td>84.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>7.89%</td>
<td>3.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed or multiple ethnic groups</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>3.76%</td>
<td>3.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>8.90%</td>
<td>1.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1.79%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African, Caribbean or Black</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>2.59%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ethnic group</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10,589
Country of Birth
B Born outside UK

| Born outside UK | 3,194 | 30.16% | 12.24% |

Spoken English
C Does not speak English well or at all

| Does not speak English well or at all | 374 | 3.53% | 2.59% |

10. ETHNICITY

Commentary
Low properties of White (British) or White (Irish) in the N/hood, instead higher proportion of other ethnicities than the city average
A
Much higher number of those born outside UK living in the N/hood than the city average
B
Higher proportion of non English speakers in N/hood compared to rest of city
C

Housing Policy Implications

The neighbourhood is popular with a range of non white groups. Demand is likely to grow in all sectors and there may be a longer term need to increase the supply of larger family accommodation

OTHER ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL INDICATORS RELATED TO HOUSING COSTS AND THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

11 Economic activity (All people aged 16 -74)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic activity</th>
<th>N/Hood %</th>
<th>City%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economically active</td>
<td>62.61%</td>
<td>64.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically inactive</td>
<td>37.39%</td>
<td>35.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never worked and long term unemployed</td>
<td>4.73%</td>
<td>9.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time students</td>
<td>37.01%</td>
<td>13.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>3.79%</td>
<td>11.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12 Car Ownership

Proportion of Households with one or more cars or vans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N/Hood</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47.49%</td>
<td>49.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary

The Neighbourhood has a slightly lower proportion of its population in employment, but has one of the highest proportions of domiciled students, a lower proportion of retired people under 74 and lower than average levels of car ownership.

From a housing affordability perspective, the proportion of residents who have never worked or long term unemployed is one of the lowest in the city at around one half of the city average.