CATHCART & SIMSHILL 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	1,173	5,085	1,308	7,566
	N/hood %	15.50%	67.21%	17.29%	
	cf city %	16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES	Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency	1,082	4,890	1,441	7,413
	N/hood %	14.60%	65.97%	19.44%	
	cf city %	16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

Commentary

Total population decrease

Higher proportion of over 65s than the city average

Housing Policy Implications

The main issues are likely to be a rise in demand for aids and adaptations and health and social care for an ageing population

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood

3,295

1

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	260	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.63%	
Proportion of all households	7.89%	14.46%
B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	133	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.50%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	51.15%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%
C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	785	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.19%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	23.82%	22.96%

D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS

% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood

Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s

In Neighbourhood

City

48,451

16.96%

N/hood

755

1.56%

22.91%

Single	nerson	househo	hl	over	65
JIIIEIE	DELOUI	HOUSEHO	ıus	Ovei	UJ.

468

36,508

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

% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood

1.28%

% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of

14.7

all households

14.20% 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

640 86,728

Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD

19.42% 30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

The neighbourhood has a very low proportion of lone

A parent households

Around half of lone parent households have dependent

- **B** children compared to a much higher city average There is a very slightly higher proportion of households
- **C** with dependent children than the city average The neighbourhood has a higher proportion of households
- **D** over 65

Working age singles under 65 are poorly represented. The neighbourhood does not appear to be attracting new smaller working age households, which may reflect the

E suburban family housing oriented nature of the area

Housing Policy Implications

None

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

		N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	1,108	33.62%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	1,056	32.04%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	497	15.08%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	413	12.53%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	166	5.03%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	35	1.06%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	10	0.30%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	10	0.30%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	3,295		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

The neighbourhood is characterised by slightly higher than average household size reflecting the suburban nature of the area

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)	2,646	550	153			3,349
	79.00%	16.42%	4.57%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	2,710	383	169	2	31	3,295
	82.24%	11.62%	5.13%			

5

CITY

TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates and	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 main changes have been a reduction in the proportion of social rented stock and the rise in the proportion of former owned (and possibly former social rented stock) being let out privately.

Housing Policy Implications

The reduction in the numbers of social rented houses gives cause for concern, as it reduces options for existing residents with specific housing needs to remain within the community. In addition, the area may now be out of bounds to first and second time buyers.

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	167	5.06%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	1,236	37.51%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	647	19.64%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	1,183	35.90%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	41	1.24%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	13	0.39%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	3	0.09%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	5	0.15%	630	0.22%
	3,295		285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

As might be expected, the neighbourhood has a much higher proportion of family sized low density residential properties

Housing Policy Implications

There may be some scope for the provision of additional smaller properties

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

N/hood City 2.3 2.02

1.57%

0.51%

A Average Household size

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

		N/hood	City
Occupied Household count		2,357	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	2,308	97.92%	96.5.%

37

12

Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room

C Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy **2**

Over 1.5 persons per room

(Source: Census Table LC4106SC by Neighbourhood)

As a proportion of households counted

2.52% 0.95%

NEIGHBOURHOOD

All households

Owned

Private rented or living rent free

Social rented

	Occupanc						
	Occupanc						
	y rating		Total			Occupancy	
All	+2 or	Occupancy	Underoccu	Underoccup	Occupancy	rating -1 or	Overcrow
households	more	rating +1	pation	ied %	rating 0	less	ded %
3295	1351	867	2218	67.31	712	365	11.07
2712	1305	734	2039	75.18	477	196	7.23
414	43	113	156	37.68	150	108	26.09
169	3	20	23	13.61	85	61	36.09

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 slightly higher than the city

A average

B The majority of property is of low density
Underoccupancy is much higher than the city average
in the owner occupied sector, but significantly lower
in the social rented sector. Conversely, there is more
overcrowding in what remains of the social rented

C sector

Housing Policy Implications

There appears to be an emerging issue of mismatch between household size and property size, affirming the need for new property construction to meet emerging needs

7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles) Occupied household spaces

Occupied household spaces with no central heating

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

N/hood	N/hood	City	City	
	3,295			
83	2.51%	11,379	3.98%	

8

7. HEATING TYPE

Commentary

There appears to be a small group of properties without central heating

Housing Policy Implications

These properties should be identified and action taken to encourage installation of new affordable heating systems. In the long term, there may be a need to encourage insulation of privately owed properties to reduce fuel bills and wasted energy

8 VACANT PROPERTIES (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties	N/hood	N/hood	City	
All Household spaces		3,377	293,876	
Vacant household spaces	79	2.34%	2.59%	
Second residence/holiday home	3	0.09%	0.19%	
Occupied	3295	97.57%	97.21%	

8. VACANCIES

Commentary

Vacancy rate is only slightly lower than city average

Housing Policy Implications

None. Suggests that properties are in good demand

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood 7,566

A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	610	8.06%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	720	9.52%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	6,236	82.42%	79.43%
B Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	5,490	72.56%	69.01%
Physical disability	406	5.37%	7.82%
Mental health condition	227	3.00%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	498	6.58%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	169	2.23%	2.49%
Learning disability	25	0.33%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	108	1.43%	2.14%
Development disorder	40	0.53%	0.64%
C Provision of Care in a household			
	404	C F20/	4.200/
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	494	6.53%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	129	1.70%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	185	2.44%	2.88%
Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a			
D household	174	3.03%	8.43%

9. HEALTH & DISABLITY IN THE HOME Commentary

A much lower proportion of the population have problems or disabilities which limit day to day

A activities

With the exception of deafness, all specifically identified medical conditions are below the city

B average

Apart from higher unpaid care needs limited to less than 20 hours per week, demand on unpaid carers

C appears to be lower than the city average

The proportion of the population with a long term sickness or disability is considerably below the city

D average

Housing Policy Implications

There were no obvious significant requirements at the time of the Census, but it is possible than demand for adapted housing and care may have risen in the intervening period. This may be reflected in demands on the local authority or housing association services, which should be reviewed at local level

GLASGOW'S HOUSING STRATEGY 2017 - 2022:

NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILES

CENSUS

PROFILE

SUMMARY	N/hood	City
6,971	92.13%	84.56%
141	1.86%	3.87%
27	0.36%	0.48%
51	0.67%	1.46%
287	3.79%	3.78%
4	0.05%	0.08%
34	0.45%	1.79%
22	0.29%	0.94%
18	0.23%	2.40%
11	0.14%	0.64%
7,566		
435	5.75%	12.24%
64	0.84%	2.59%
	6,971 141 27 51 287 4 34 22 18 11 7,566	6,971 92.13% 141 1.86% 27 0.36% 51 0.67% 287 3.79% 4 0.05% 34 0.45% 22 0.29% 18 0.23% 11 0.14% 7,566

10. ETHNICITY COMMENTARY

Commentary

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

A whole

Lower proportion of residents born outside UK than rest of

B city

The proportion of non-English speakers is lower than the

C city average

Housing Policy Implications

Neighbourhood appears to be less attractive to ethnic minority communities with the exception of one long established community. 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	72.82%	64.49%
Economically inactive	27.18%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	3.36%	9.05%
Full time students	8.37%	13.73%
Retired	15.55%	11.32%
12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or vans	75.17%	49.18%

Commentary

The neighbourhood has a high 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, the proportion of residents who have never worked or who are long term unemployed is one of the lowest in the city

