

CARMUNNOCK 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			157	520	180	857
N/hood %			18.32%	60.68%	21.00%	
cf city %			16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES		Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
Frequency			152	538	195	885
N/hood %			17.18%	60.79%	22.03%	
cf city %			16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT
Commentary
 Total population **increase of 28 (3.3%)**
 Similar to the city average

Housing Policy Implications
 None

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood **364**

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	28	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.07%	
Proportion of all households	10.98%	14.46%

B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	18	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.07%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	64.28%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%

C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	105	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.16%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	28.84%	22.96%

D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	108	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	0.22%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	29.67%	16.96%

Single person households over 65	65	36,508
(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbourhood)		
% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	0.17%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	17.85%	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	52	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	14.28%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

The proportion of single parent families is considerably

A lower than the city average

The proportion of one parent households with dependent

B children is in line with the city average

The neighbourhood has a higher than average proportion

C of households with dependent children

The neighbourhood has a high proportion of single

D households over 65 years of age

Conversely, the neighbourhood has a relatively small proportion of single households under 65 years of age -

E around half of the city average

Housing Policy Implications

The neighbourhood appears, on paper, at least, to lack some balance in terms of household type. This may be a reflection of the isolated nature of the settlement and possibly the historic pattern of settlement, type of housing available, housing costs and access to social rented stock

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	117	32.14%
Occupied by Two people	117	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	52	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	48	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	24	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	4	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	2	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	0	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	364	

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

There are slightly more two-person households in the neighbourhood than the city average and slightly more larger family households

Housing Policy Implications

None

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)	300	41	27			368
	81.52%	11.14%	7.34%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	307	17	36	2	2	364
	84.34%	4.67%	9.89%			
CITY						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates and 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

More than four-fifths of the stock remains in the owner occupied sector. There has been an increase in the proportion of private rented properties

Housing Policy Implications

There is a danger that more stock will be lost to the owner occupied and social rented sectors. Housing providers should consider providing replacement housing. This may also boost population which has fallen unexpectedly against the wider trend in what appears to be a stable residential suburb.

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	193	53.02%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	46	12.64%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	73	20.05%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	45	12.36%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	7	1.92%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	0	0.14%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	0	0.00%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	0	0.00%	630	0.22%
	364		285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

over 85% of stock is detached, semi detached or terraced which is in keeping with the semi rural nature of the settlement

Housing Policy Implications

There may come a point where older residents are unable to maintain or heat their existing properties. There is a question as to available supported accommodation within the area, and whether these individuals would need to purchase a property elsewhere or move to accommodation in another area on the Southside of the city

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	City
A Average Household size	2.35	2.02

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

	N/hood	City
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	298	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	295	98.99%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	3	1.01%
Over 1.5 persons per room	0	0.00%

C Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy ²

(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	364	237	51	288	79.12	49	27	7.42
Owned	309	229	41	270	87.38	29	10	3.23
Private rented or living rent free	19	7	3	10	52.63	6	3	15.78
Social rented	36	1	7	8	22.22	14	14	38.88
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

There is a higher overall average household size, perhaps reflecting the higher proportions of children

A in the neighbourhood

B Densities are better than the city average

There is a considerable degree of underoccupation. This is likely to reflect the number of rooms in properties in the owner occupied sector and the number of two person households. There is also some evidence of overcrowding in the social rented sector which is much higher than the city average

C overall

Housing Policy Implications

There appears to be a shortage of larger family accommodation in the social rented sector. The issue of older residents being able to continue to live in their own homes independently needs to be considered

(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
		364		
	1	0.27%	11,379	3.98%

7. HEATING TYPE

Commentary

The number of properties lacking central heating is very small

Housing Policy Implications

Individual owners and social landlords should consider augmenting insulation to the stock if they have not already done so

8 VACANT PROPERTIES (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties

	N/hood	N/hood	City
All Household spaces		369	293,876
Vacant household spaces	5	1.88%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	0	0.00%	0.19%
Occupied	364	98.64%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES

Commentary

Vacancies at the time of the Census are likely to have been empty properties on the market or temporarily void social or private rented dwellings

Housing Policy Implications

None

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood	857		
A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	63	7.35%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	81	9.45%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	713	83.20%	79.43%
B Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	635	74.09%	69.01%
Physical disability	53	6.18%	7.82%
Mental health condition	30	3.50%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	57	6.65%	6.08%
Blindness or partial sight loss	23	2.68%	2.49%
Learning disability	5	0.58%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	12	1.40%	2.14%
Development disorder	8	0.93%	0.64%
C Provision of Care in a household			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	66	7.70%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	10	1.17%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	19	2.21%	2.88%
D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household	23	3.67%	8.43%

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

Long term health and disability rates are similar to

A the city average

The prevalence of individual specific conditions is

B generally lower than elsewhere in the city

Unpaid care of 1 - 19 hours is higher as a proportion of the population. However unpaid care of 20 - 50

C hours per week is lower

There is a comparatively low proportion of the working age group with a long term sickness or a

D disability

Housing Policy Implications

None

ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census

A Neighbourhood Profiles)

Ethnic Origin

White British or Irish

White Other

Mixed or multiple ethnic groups

Indian

Pakistani

Bangladeshi

Chinese

Other Asian

African, Caribbean or Black

Other ethnic group

CENSUS
PROFILE
SUMMAR

	Y	N/hood	City
Frequency			
White British or Irish	811	94.63%	84.56%
White Other	22	2.57%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	1	0.01%	0.48%
Indian	4	0.47%	1.46%
Pakistani	7	0.82%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	1	0.01%	0.08%
Chinese	7	0.82%	1.79%
Other Asian	1	0.01%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	1	0.01%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	2	0.23%	0.64%
	857		

B Country of Birth

Born outside UK	32	3.74%	12.24%
-----------------	----	-------	---------------

C Spoken English

Does not speak English well or at all	4	0.47%	2.59%
---------------------------------------	---	-------	--------------

10. ETHNICITY

Commentary

Higher proportion of White (British or Irish) than city as a whole

Lower proportion of residents born outside UK than rest of city

The proportion of non-English speakers is lower than the city average

Housing Policy Implications

Neighbourhood appears to be less attractive to ethnic minority communities. Providers should consider marketing of properties for a wider diversity of ethnic groups

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	46.69%	64.49%
Economically inactive	35.31%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	3.83%	9.05%
Full time students	8.94%	13.73%
Retired	19.65%	11.32%

12 Car Ownership

	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or vans	81.86%	49.18%

Commentary

The Neighbourhood has a much lower 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 very high level of car ownership

From a housing affordability perspective, those residents who have never worked or who are long term unemployed is one of the lowest in the city

