

YORKHILL & ANDERSTON 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		866	9,170	553	10,589
	N/hood %		8.17	86.59	5.22	99.98
	cf city %		16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES		Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency		998	9,894	613	11,505
	N/hood %		8.67	85.99	5.33	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

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**

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	335	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.81%	
Proportion of all households	6.42%	14.46%

B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	209	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.79%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	62.39%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%

C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	607	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.93%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	11.64%	22.96%

D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	370	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	0.76%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	7.09%	16.96%

Single person households over 65	303	36,508
(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbourhood)		
% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	0.83%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	5.81%	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	2,217	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	42.51%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

N/hood has a lower than average proportion of lone

A parent households

Proportion of lone parent households with dependent

B children is lower than the city average

N/hood has a much lower proportion of households with

C dependent children than the city average

N/hood has a much lower proportion of over 65s than

D the city average

N/hood has a much higher proportion of under 65 single

E 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

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	2520	48.32%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	1783	34.19%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	538	10.32%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	236	4.53%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	106	2.03%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	21	0.40%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	7	0.13%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	4	0.08%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	5,215		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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)

NEIGHBOURHOOD	Owner	Private	Social	Shared	Total
	Occupied	Rented	Rented	ownershi p Rent free	
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates)	1,699	2,307	1544		5,550
	30.61%	41.56%	27.82%		

TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	1,559	2,205	1,343	31	77	5,215
	29.89%	42.28%	25.75%	0.59%	1.48%	
CITY						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates a	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

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)

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

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)

	N/hood	City
A Average Household size	1.80	2.02

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

	N/hood	City
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	3,758	204,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	3,635	96.73%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	80	2.13%
Over 1.5 persons per room	43	1.14%
Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy	3,758	

(Source: Census Table LC4106SC by Neighbourhood)

C NEIGHBOURHOOD

	Occupancy rating +2 or more	Occupancy rating +1	Total Underoccupation	Underoccupied %	Occupancy rating 0	Occupancy rating -1 or less	Overcrowded %
All households	5215	1308	1674	32.09	2298	1243	23.83
Owned	1590	468	687	43.2	646	257	16.16
Private rented or living rent free	2282	534	629	27.56	1011	642	28.13
Social rented	1343	306	358	26.66	641	344	25.61

CITY

All households	285693	83843	137085	47.98	98916	49692	17.39
Owned	130217	43625	84630	64.99	32838	12749	9.79
Private rented or living rent free	50665	12217	16246	32.07	21132	13287	26.23
Social rented	104811	28001	36209	34.54	44946	23656	22.57

6. OVERCROWDING AND UNDER OCCUPATION

Commentary

Lower average household size in the N/hood than

A city average

Proportion of households not sharing bedrooms is

B similar to city average

However, there is overcrowding in all three tenures above the city average and much lower levels of

C 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)

HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

7 Occupied household spaces

Occupied household spaces with no central heating

	N/hood	N/hood	City	City
		5,215		
	315	6.04%	11,379	3.98%

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

	N/hood	N/hood	City
All Household spaces			
Vacant household spaces		5,482	293,876
Second residence/holiday home	240	4.38%	2.59%
Occupied	27	0.49%	0.19%
	5215	95.13%	97.21%

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	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	591	5.58%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	657	6.20%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	9,341	88.21%	79.43%
B Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	8,500	80.27%	69.01%
Physical disability	378	3.57%	7.82%
Mental health condition	504	4.76%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	306	2.89%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	152	1.44%	2.49%
Learning disability	14	0.13%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	248	2.34%	2.14%
Development disorder	40	0.38%	0.64%
C Provision of Care in a household			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	334	3.15%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	128	1.21%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	89	0.84%	2.88%
D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household	369	3.48%	8.43%

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

N/hood residents have much better mobility than

A city average

N/hood residents have less long term health issues

B than city as a whole

N/hood residents affected are likely to require

C shorter term unpaid care

Lower proportion of long term sick and disabled in

D working age population

Housing Policy Implications

None

ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

CENSUS PROFILE SUMMARY **N/hood** **City**

A Ethnic Origin

Frequency

White British or Irish	7,025	66.34%	84.56%
White Other	835	7.89%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	114	1.08%	0.48%
Indian	614	5.80%	1.46%
Pakistani	398	3.76%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	23	0.22%	0.08%
Chinese	942	8.90%	1.79%
Other Asian	190	1.79%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	274	2.59%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	174	1.64%	0.64%
	10,589		

Country of Birth

B Born outside UK	3,194	30.16%	12.24%
--------------------------	-------	--------	---------------

Spoken English

C 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

A than the city average

Much higher number of those born outside UK living in

B the N/hood than the city average

Higher proportion of non English speakers in N/hood

C compared to rest of city

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)	N/Hood %	City%
Economically active	62.61%	64.49%
Economically inactive	37.39%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	4.73%	9.05%
Full time students	37.01%	13.73%
Retired	3.79%	11.32%

12 Car Ownership

Proportion of Households with one or more cars or vans

N/Hood**47.49%****City**

49.18%

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

