

BELLAHOUSTON, CRAIGTON & MOSSPARK 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		1,314	5,467	1,961	8,742
	N/hood %		15.03%	62.54%	22.43%	
	cf city %		16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES		Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency		1,303	5,615	1,766	8,684
	N/hood %		15.00%	64.66%	20.34%	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

Commentary

Total population **decrease** (-58)
 Lower working age population compared to city average. Significantly higher proportion of over age 65 residents

Housing Policy Implications

Likely to be a requirement to meet the housing needs of an ageing population

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood **4,268**

GLASGOW'S HOUSING STRATEGY 2017 - 2022 : NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILES

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	551	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.33%	
Proportion of all households	12.90%	14.46%

B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILD	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	304	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.15%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	55.17%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%

C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	909	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.38%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	21.30%	22.96%

D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,234	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.75%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	28.91%	16.96%

Single person households over 65	942	36,508
---	-----	--------

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

% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.58%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	22.07%	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	978	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	22.91%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

The neighbourhood has a lower proportion of
A lone parent households than the city average
 Similarly the proportion of lone parent households
B with dependent children is lower than the average

There is a lower rate of households with dependent
C children compared to the city average

The neighbourhood is strongly skewed towards an
 ageing population with nearly twice the city average
D for single elderly households
 Single person households under 65 are poorly
E represented by comparison

Housing Policy Implications

The area is clearly popular with an older population. However, there is a question about the long term and the opportunities to further encourage younger households to move into the area

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	1,863	43.65%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	1,267	29.68%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	550	12.88%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	388	9.09%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	132	3.09%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	41	0.96%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	9	0.21%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	18	0.42%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	4,268		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

One person households are the most represented group. Above city average.

Housing Policy Implications

There may be a need to encourage more newly formed two person households to settle in the neighbourhood

4 HOUSING TENURE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	Owner Occupied	Private Rented	Social Rented	Shared ownership	Rent free	Total
NEIGHBOURHOOD	2,610	611	1,205			4,426
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates)	58.96%	13.80%	27.22%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	2,609	370	1,241	4	44	4,268
	61.13%	8.67%	29.08%			
CITY						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimate)	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

The proportion of private rented properties has almost doubled since the Census, with properties moving to the PRS from both the owner occupied and social rented sectors

Housing Policy Implications

Given the high demand for properties in this neighbourhood, there is a case to be made for replacing some of this stock, especially in terms of bringing back families with children.

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	172	4.02%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	1,126	26.38%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	419	9.82%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	2,489	58.32%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	52	1.21%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	9	0.21%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	1	0.02%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	0	0.00%	630	0.22%
	4,268		285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

Although tenements and multi storey flats make up the largest proportion of stock, there is a good supply of low density housing

Housing Policy Implications

None

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	City
A Average Household size	2.05	2.02

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

	N/hood	City
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	3,169	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	3,093	97.60%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	59	1.86%
Over 1.5 persons per room	17	0.54%

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	4268	1050	1550	2600	60.91	1116	552	12.93
Owned	2613	878	976	1854	70.95	554	205	7.85
Private rented or living rent free	414	46	132	178	42.99	135	101	24.4
Social rented	1241	126	442	568	45.77	427	246	19.82
CITY								
All households	285693	53242	83843	137085	47.98	98916	49692	17.39
Owned	130217	41005	43625	84630	64.99	32838	12749	9.79
Private rented or living rent free	50665	4029	12217	16246	32.07	21132	13287	26.23
Social rented	104811	8208	28001	36209	34.54	44946	23656	22.57

6. OVERCROWDING AND UNDER OCCUPATION

Commentary

Average household size is in line with the city

A average

There are lower room densities compared to the

B city average

Underoccupation is considerably higher than the city average across all tenures, and

C overcrowding is also lower across all tenures

Housing Policy Implications

In the social rented sector, there is some scope to let properties to larger households at the end of current tenancies, based on housing need and waiting/transfer lists.

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Occupied household spaces

Occupied household spaces with no central heating

N/hood	N/hood	City	City
	4,405		
130	2.95%	11,379	3.98%

7. HEATING TYPE

Commentary

The proportion of properties without central heating is lower than the city average

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		4,405	293,876
Vacant household spaces	133	3.02%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	4	0.09%	0.19%
Occupied	4268	96.88%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES

Commentary

There was a higher than expected vacancy rate at the time of the Census

Housing Policy Implications

Some checking is required to see if current vacancy rates are still running at this rate and if so, to determine the reasons why so that action can be taken to maximise the use of housing stock

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood	8,742		
A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	1,362	15.58%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	1,102	12.60%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	6,278	71.81%	79.43%
B Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	5,514	63.07%	69.01%
Physical disability	871	9.96%	7.82%
Mental health condition	478	5.47%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	819	9.37%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	308	3.52%	2.49%
Learning disability	63	0.72%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	163	1.86%	2.14%
Development disorder	77	0.88%	0.64%
C Provision of Care in a household			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	473	5.41%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	195	2.23%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	380	4.34%	2.88%
D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household	501	7.95%	8.43%

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

A higher proportion of the population has a condition which limits their day to day activities

A than the city average

Physical disability and sensory impairment are more prevalent in this neighbourhood. This is likely to relate to the age profile of the

B population

Higher proportions of the population need some

C form of unpaid care across the three time bands

The proportion of the working age population with a long term sickness or disability is below

D the city average

Housing Policy Implications

The higher proportions of elderly people in the neighbourhood and the health conditions associated suggest the need to bring together housing and health/social care specialists to work more intensively with clients to improve their ability to remain in their homes for longer periods of time to avoid hospitalisation and longer house vacancy periods

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

ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census

A Neighbourhood Profiles)

Ethnic Origin

Frequency

White British or Irish	7,820	89.45%	84.56%
White Other	144	1.64%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	44	0.50%	0.48%
Indian	95	1.09%	1.46%
Pakistani	435	4.97%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	0	0.00%	0.08%
Chinese	46	0.53%	1.79%
Other Asian	38	0.43%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	97	1.10%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	23	0.26%	0.64%
	8,742		

B Country of Birth

Born outside UK	598	6.84%	12.24%
-----------------	-----	-------	---------------

C Spoken English

Does not speak English well or at all	140	1.60%	2.59%
---------------------------------------	-----	-------	--------------

10. ETHNICITY

Commentary

than the city average, although there is a proportionately larger Pakistani population compared with the majority of neighbourhoods in

A the city

The proportion of residents born outside the UK and resident in the neighbourhood is half of the city wide

B rate

The proportion of non-English speakers is lower than

C the city average

Housing Policy Implications

None

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	64.19%	64.49%
Economically inactive	35.81%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	6.83%	9.05%
Full time students	8.50%	13.73%
Retired	16.19%	11.32%

12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or va	52.48%	49.18%

Commentary

The neighbourhood has a close to average proportion of its population in employment and 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 higher level of car ownership

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

