CARMUNNOCK NEIGHBOURHOOD

1 POPULATION PROFILE 3-YEAR CHANGE

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011 CENSUS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age band</td>
<td>0 - 15</td>
<td>16 - 64</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>TOTAL POP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/hood %</td>
<td>18.32%</td>
<td>60.68%</td>
<td>21.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cf city %</td>
<td>16.12</td>
<td>70.03</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
### GLASGOW'S HOUSING STRATEGY 2017 - 2022: NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILES

#### A. LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Neighbourhood</th>
<th>N/hood</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41,315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of city total in this Neighbourhood: 0.07%
Proportion of all households: 10.98% 14.46%

#### B. LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Neighbourhood</th>
<th>N/hood</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26,513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Neighbourhood</th>
<th>N/hood</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>65,612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Neighbourhood</th>
<th>N/hood</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>48,451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood: 0.22%
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s: 29.67% 16.96%
GLASGOW'S HOUSING STRATEGY 2017 - 2022: NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILES

Single person households over 65

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households</td>
<td>17.85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD</td>
<td>14.28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

A The proportion of single parent families is considerably lower than the city average.

B The proportion of one parent households with dependent children is in line with the city average.

C The neighbourhood has a higher than average proportion of households with dependent children.

D The neighbourhood has a high proportion of single households over 65 years of age.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>Frequency N/hood</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One person</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>43.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two people</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>30.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three people</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four people</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five people</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six people</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven people</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight or more</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES</td>
<td>364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Occupied</th>
<th>Private Rented</th>
<th>Social Rented</th>
<th>Shared Ownership</th>
<th>Rent free</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEIGHBOURHOOD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.52%</td>
<td>11.14%</td>
<td>7.34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84.34%</td>
<td>4.67%</td>
<td>9.89%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates and Stock Change Comparator 2009/2014)</td>
<td>128,641</td>
<td>60,465</td>
<td>107,167</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.40%</td>
<td>20.40%</td>
<td>36.39%</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.95%</td>
<td>16.80%</td>
<td>36.68%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 than 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

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

**A Average Household size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N/hood</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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>298</td>
<td>202,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>98.99% 96.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1.5 persons per room</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.01% 2.52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIGHBOURHOOD</th>
<th>All households</th>
<th>Occupancy rating +2 or more</th>
<th>Occupancy rating +1</th>
<th>Total Underoccupancy</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>364</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>79.12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>87.38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private rented or living rent free</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social rented</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>All households</th>
<th>Occupancy rating +2 or more</th>
<th>Occupancy rating +1</th>
<th>Total Underoccupancy</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>
<td>17.39</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>
<td>9.79</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>
<td>26.23</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>
<td>22.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. OVERCROWDING AND UNDER OCCUPATION

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

A 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupied household spaces</th>
<th>364</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied household spaces with no central heating</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties</th>
<th>N/hood</th>
<th>N/hood</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Household spaces</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>293,876</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant household spaces</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
<td>2.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second residence/holiday home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>98.64%</td>
<td>97.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N/hood</th>
<th>N/hood</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Long term health/disability in a household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day to day activity limited a lot</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7.35%</td>
<td>11.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day to day activity limited a little</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>9.45%</td>
<td>9.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day to day activity not limited</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>83.20%</td>
<td>79.43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N/hood</th>
<th>N/hood</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Long term health condition in a household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No condition</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>74.09%</td>
<td>69.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical disability</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6.18%</td>
<td>7.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health condition</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>6.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deafness or partial hearing loss</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6.65%</td>
<td>6.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blindness of partial sight loss</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning disability</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning difficulty</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development disorder</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C Provision of Care in a household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>4.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or more hours unpaid care per week</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.21%</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.67%</td>
<td>8.43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

A Long term health and disability rates are similar to the city average.

B The prevalence of individual specific conditions is 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 hours per week is lower.

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

Housing Policy Implications

None

ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

A Neighbourhood Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>N/hood</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British or Irish</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>94.63% 84.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.57% 3.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed or multiple ethnic groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01% 0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.47% 1.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.82% 3.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01% 0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.82% 1.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01% 0.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African, Caribbean or Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01% 2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ethnic group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.23% 0.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
A
Lower proportion of residents born outside UK than rest of city
B
The proportion of non-English speakers is lower than the city average
C

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%
Car Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N/Hood</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Households with one or more cars or vans</td>
<td>81.86%</td>
<td>49.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.