

ARDEN & CARNWADRIC 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		2,001	6,500	1,067	9,667
	N/hood %		20.70%	67.24%	11.04%	
	cf city %		16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES		Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency		1,912	6,270	1,098	9,280
	N/hood %		20.60%	67.56%	11.83%	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

Commentary

Total population **decrease** of 387 (4%)

Significantly higher proportion of children in the population compared to the city average

Housing Policy Implications

The neighbourhood probably requires to attract more working age households with or without children

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in Neighbourhood **4,312**

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	871	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.10%	
Proportion of all households	20.19%	14.46%

B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	625	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.35%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	72.90%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%

C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,424	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.17%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	33.02%	22.96%

D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	593	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.22%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	13.75%	16.96%

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

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

Single person households over 65

% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood
 % of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households

414	36,508
1.13%	
9.82%	12.78%

E ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65

ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65
 Proportion of one person HH under 65 as a proportion of all households

N/hood	City
1209	86,728
28.03%	30.35%

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

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

N/hood has higher than average proportion of lone parent

A households

Proportion of lone parent households with dependent

B children is also higher than the rest of the city

N/hood has higher proportion of households with

C dependent children compared to the city average

N/hood contains lower proportion of all-over 65

D households than city average and single over 65s

Lower than city average proportion of one person

E households under 65

Housing policy implications

Housing providers should consider increasing supply of housing for younger households

3 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	1,623	37.64%
Occupied by Two people	1,230	28.52%
Occupied by Three people	699	16.31%
Occupied by Four people	477	11.06%
Occupied by Five people or more	204	4.73%
Occupied by Six people	60	1.39%
Occupied by Seven people	17	0.39%
Occupied by Eight or more people	2	0.05%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	4,312	

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

One and two person households lower than city average.
Properties occupied by 3 or more people higher than city average

Formation of smaller households appears to be slow, although this may reflect existing housing supply

Housing policy implications

There is a need to encourage new households to form to create sustainable demand for existing housing stock in the future

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)	1,644	352	2,510			4,506
	36.48%	7.81%	55.70%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	1,689	246	2,322	34	21	4,312
	39.16%	5.70%	53.84%			
CITY						
TENURE COMPARISON (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

Social renting remains the dominant tenure. There has been a small increase in stock and proportion of the private rented sector accommodation

Housing policy implications

The neighbourhood may be able to attract more new households if there is adequate supply

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	390	9.04%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	549	12.73%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	279	6.47%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	3,069	71.17%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	13	0.30%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	4	0.09%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	0	0.00%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	8	0.18%	630	0.22%
	4,312		285793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

For a modern peripheral area, the neighbourhood contains a surprisingly higher proportion of tenements than might have been expected. This may be reflected in the dominant stock types where local providers have opted to retain high density stock

Housing policy implications

Housing providers should consider introducing diversity of stock type by providing more family sized property at medium density

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

A Average Household size

N/hood	City
2.23%	2.02%

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

Occupied Household count

Up to 0.5 persons per room

Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room

Over 1.5 persons per room

	N/hood	City
		202,466
2,787	94.86%	96.5%
117	3.98%	2.52%
34	1.15%	0.95%
2,938		

Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy

C

(Source: Census Table LC4106SC by Neighbourhood)

NEIGHBOURHOOD

All households

Owned

Private rented or living rent free

Social rented

All households	Occupancy rating +2 or more	Occupancy rating +1	Total Underoccupiation	Underoccupied %	Occupancy rating 0	Occupancy rating -1 or less	Overcrowded %
4312	784	1414	2198	50.97	1365	749	17.37
1723	571	565	1136	65.93	423	164	9.52
267	42	74	116	43.44	100	51	19.1
2322	171	775	946	40.74	842	534	23

CITY

All households

Owned

Private rented or living rent free

Social rented

285693	53242	83843	137085	47.98	98916	49692	17.39
130217	41005	43625	84630	64.99	32838	12749	9.79
50665	4029	12217	16246	32.07	21132	13287	26.23
104811	8208	28001	36209	34.54	44946	23656	22.57

6. OVERCROWDING AND UNDER OCCUPATION

Commentary

The neighbourhood has a slightly higher than average

A household size

B Densities in current stock are higher than city average

In spite of higher apparent densities, overcrowding does not appear to be a significant issue. In fact there appears to be significant underoccupation in both the

C private rented and social rented sectors

Housing policy implications

None

7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Occupied household spaces

Occupied household spaces with no central heating

N/hood	N/hood	City
		11,379
113	2.62%	3.98%

7 HEATING TYPE COMMENTARY

Neighbourhood has higher than average proportion of properties with central heating.

Housing Policy Implications

There is likely to be some fuel poverty in this neighbourhood affecting elderly people and poorer families being unable to heat larger properties. All owners and landlords operating in the neighbourhood should consider improving insulation.

8 VACANT PROPERTIES (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties

	N/hood	N/hood	City
All Household spaces		4,411	293,876
Vacant household spaces	95	2.15%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	4	0.09%	0.19%
Occupied	4312	97.75%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES

Commentary

Vacancy rates are close to city average

Housing policy implications

None

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total residents in neighbourhood **9,667**

A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	1,169	12.09%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	947	9.80%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	7,551	80.17%	79.43%

B Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	6730	69.61%	69.01%
Physical disability	710	7.34%	7.82%
Mental health condition	648	6.70%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	479	4.95%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	226	2.34%	2.49%
Learning disability	46	0.47%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	223	2.30%	2.14%
Development disorder	60	0.62%	0.64%
C Provision of Care in a household			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	350	3.62%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	184	1.90%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	299	3.09%	2.88%
D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household	697	9.76%	8.43%

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

Rates of long term disability are similar to the city

A average

Individual health conditions are generally better than

B the city average

The proportion of residents requiring unpaid care is lower than the city average except for those requiring 50 or more

C hours of care per week

The proportion of long term sick and disabled is higher

D than the city average

Housing policy implications

There may be a need to find out more about long term housing needs of those requiring care

10 ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Census 2011)**A Ethnic Origin****Ethnic Origin**

	CENSUS PROFILE SUMMARY	N/hood	City
White British or Irish	7,583	78.44%	84.56%
White Other	643	6.65%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	41	0.42%	0.48%
Indian	87	0.90%	1.46%
Pakistani	774	8.00%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	2	0.02%	0.08%
Chinese	110	1.13%	1.79%
Other Asian	104	1.07%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	303	3.13%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	20	0.21%	0.64%
	9,667		

B Country of Birth

Born outside UK	1,418	14.66%	12.24%
-----------------	-------	--------	---------------

C Spoken English

Does not speak English well or at all	404	4.18%	2.59%
---------------------------------------	-----	-------	--------------

10. ETHNICITY COMMENTARY

Commentary

At the time of the Census, there was a higher proportion of non-white residents than the city average and by

- A** comparison to other areas on the periphery of the city
- This is reflected in the higher proportion of residents born
- B** outside the UK

- Residents unable to speak English was nearly twice the city
- C** average

Housing policy implications

Housing providers may wish to consider comparing current ethnic populations with the Census outputs to measure change (if any) since then, and to consider ways in which ethnic groups (mainly with refugee status) could be further be integrated into the community

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	62.55%	64.49%
Economically inactive	37.45%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	12.60%	9.05%
Full time students	9.41%	13.73%
Retired	11.27%	11.32%
12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or vans	47.86%	49.18%

Commentary

The Neighbourhood has slightly below the proportion of its population in employment to the city average, a low student population living at home , a similar proportion of retired persons under 74 years of age to the average and lower levels of car ownership

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

