

CASTLEMILK 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		3,041	9,856	2,092	14,989
	N/hood %		20.29%	65.75%	13.96%	
	cf city %		16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES		Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency		3,033	9,797	2,117	14,947
	N/hood %		20.29%	65.54%	14.16%	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

Commentary
 Population has **decreased** by 42

The neighbourhood has a consistently higher than average child population. Working age population remains below the city average and there has been a rise in the proportion of over 65s

Housing Policy Implications
 There is no sign of population growth and no major changes to household composition, suggesting that there has been little in the way of any new housing supply in recent years

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood	7,057	
A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,715	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	4.15%	
Proportion of all households	24.30%	14.46%
B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,112	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	4.19%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	64.83%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%
C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	2,081	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	3.17%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	28.64%	22.96%
D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1209	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.49%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	17.13%	16.96%

Single person households over 65	979	36,508
(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbourhood)		
% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.68%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	13.87%	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	1942	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	27.52%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

The neighbourhood has one of the highest proportions of

A lone parent families in the city

The neighbourhood also has a slightly higher than average

B proportion of lone parent families with dependent children

The neighbourhood also has one of the highest proportions

C of families with dependent children

The proportion of single over age 65 households is higher

D than the city average

There is a slightly lower proportion of single households

E under 65 compared to the city average

Housing Policy Implications

The population being dominated by family households appears to be highly dependent on social rented housing. This may be a legacy of the intense investment made in the area in the 1980s and 1990s and the lack of tenure diversification, and possibly lack of availability of land or will to create more diversity.

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	2,921	41.39%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	1,983	28.09%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	1,147	16.25%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	690	9.77%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	241	3.41%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	55	0.78%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	19	0.27%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	1	0.01%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	7,057		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

Household sizes are broadly in line with city averages, but with a slightly higher proportion of 3 and 4 person households

Housing Policy Implications

None - Housing stock broadly fits population structure

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)	1,640	379	5,098			7,117
	23.04%	5.32%	71.63%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	1675	278	5050	39	15	7,057
	23.73%	3.94%	71.56%			
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

Owner occupation has fallen slightly with a commensurate increase in private renting. The proportion of social rented stock has also risen slightly

Housing Policy Implications

The proportion of owner occupied stock appears to have peaked and the tenure looks unlikely to grow unless a concerted effort is made to encourage new households on higher incomes to settle in the community

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	309	4.38%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	801	11.35%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	1,172	16.60%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	4,709	57.80%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	47	0.66%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	2	0.03%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	3	0.04%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	14	0.19%	630	0.22%
	7,057		285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

The neighbourhood has a higher proportion of terraced properties and a slightly lower proportion of tenements and multi storey flats compared to the city average

Housing Policy Implications

Sustainable demand for tenemental and multi storey stock should be kept under review, given the location of the neighbourhood on the edge 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	2.09	2.02

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

	N/hood	City
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	4,863	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	4,701 96.66%	96.5%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	113 2.32%	2.52%
Over 1.5 persons per room	49 1.00%	0.95%
	4,863	

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	7057	973	2449	3422	48.49	2501	1134	16.07
Owned	1714	492	659	1151	67.15	418	145	8.46
Private rented or living rent free	293	46	97	143	48.8	102	48	16.38
Social rented	5050	435	1693	2128	42.05	1981	941	18.63
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

Neighbourhood average household size is in line with

A city average

B Densities are in line with city averages

Underoccupation varies between tenures, with higher levels of underoccupation in the social rented and private rented sectors. There is much less overcrowding in the neighbourhood compared to the

C city overall.

Housing Policy Implications

There appears to be a good fit between property size and household composition, therefore there appear to be no policy implications

(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
Occupied household spaces		7,057		
Occupied household spaces with no central heating	59	0.84%	11,379	3.98%

7. HEATING TYPE

Commentary

Neighbourhood has higher than average proportion of properties with central heating. However there is likely to be a high level of fuel poverty, although this needs to be confirmed. It is likely that there will be better than average levels of insulation following extensive investment in the fabric of the housing stock in the 1980s and 1990s

Housing Policy Implications

Fuel poverty levels should be compared with similar neighbourhoods to check whether or not further insulation work is required.

8 VACANT PROPERTIES (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties

	N/hood	N/hood	City
All Household spaces		7,124	293,876
Vacant household spaces	63	0.88%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	4	0.06%	0.19%
Occupied	7057	99.05%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES

Commentary

There is a very high level of occupancy. Demand does not appear to be an issue

Housing Policy Implications

None

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood

14,989

A Long term health/disability in a household

	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	2,782	18.56%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	1,774	11.83%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	10,433	69.60%	79.43%

B Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	9,324	62.20%	69.01%
Physical disability	1,649	11.00%	7.82%
Mental health condition	1,402	9.35%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	1,042	6.95%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	421	2.81%	2.49%
Learning disability	155	1.03%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	409	2.73%	2.14%
Development disorder	120	0.80%	0.64%
C Provision of Care in a household			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	528	3.52%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	353	2.35%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	565	3.77%	2.88%
D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household	1,635	10.90%	8.43%

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

N/hood residents have significantly poorer mobility

A than city average

N/hood residents have more long term health issues

B than city as a whole

N/hood residents affected more likely to require shorter term unpaid care of between 20 and 50 hours

C per week

The proportion of the population which is reported as being long term sick or disabled remains above the

D city average.

Housing Policy Implications

Local providers should work with health and social care professionals to provide enhanced support for carers, and make homes more accessible in terms of mobility, particularly residents requiring to be discharged from hospital

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

ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census

A Neighbourhood Profiles)

Ethnic Origin

	Frequency		
White British or Irish	14,060	93.80%	84.56%
White Other	294	1.96%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	22	0.15%	0.48%
Indian	47	0.31%	1.46%
Pakistani	171	1.14%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	2	0.01%	0.08%
Chinese	42	0.28%	1.79%
Other Asian	33	0.22%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	282	1.88%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	36	0.24%	0.64%
	14,989		

B Country of Birth

Born outside UK	767	5.12%	12.24%
-----------------	-----	-------	---------------

C Spoken English

Does not speak English well or at all	269	1.79%	2.59%
---------------------------------------	-----	-------	--------------

10. ETHNICITY

Commentary

Higher proportion of White (British or Irish) compared to **A** city as a whole, and one of the least ethnically diverse

Lower proportion of residents born outside UK than rest of **B** 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	57.73%	64.49%
Economically inactive	42.27%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	14.49%	9.05%
Full time students	6.64%	13.73%
Retired	12.62%	11.32%

12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or vans	37.65%	49.18%

Commentary

The neighbourhood has below the proportion of its population in employment compared to the city average, a low student population living at home, but a slightly higher proportion of retired persons under 74 years of age compared 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 substantially above the city average.

