

CORKERHILL & NORTH POLLOK 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		1,085	3,107	575	4,767
	N/hood %		22.76%	65.18%	12.06%	
	cf city %		16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES		Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency		914	2,924	590	4,428
	N/hood %		20.64%	66.03%	13.32%	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

Commentary
 Total population decrease of 118 (-2.4%)

Housing Policy Implications

Lack of population growth suggest a need to boost supply of attractive affordable properties

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood **1,960**

GLASGOW'S HOUSING STRATEGY 2017 - 2022: NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILES

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS

	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	473	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.14%	
Proportion of all households	24.13%	14.46%

B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	312	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.17%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	65.96%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%

C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	702	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.07%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	35.82%	22.96%

D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS

	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	322	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	0.66%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	16.42%	16.96%

Single person households over 65	237	36,508
---	-----	--------

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

% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	0.65%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	12.09%	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	369	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	18.82%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

The neighbourhood has one of the highest proportions
A of lone parent families in the city

The neighbourhood has a high proportion of lone
B parent families with dependent children
 There is well above average proportion of households
C containing dependent children

The proportion of single over 65s is similar to the city
D average

There are fewer single person households under 65
E compared to the city average

Housing Policy Implications

Historically, this was a high density area of larger tenement and family homes built immediately after the second world war to meet the needs of larger families from the south west of Glasgow

Both areas have undergone significant change, with a reduction in overall densities. Nevertheless the properties appear still to be geared towards larger households

Consideration should be given to ways of attracting in smaller households of working age

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	606	30.92%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	571	29.13%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	347	17.70%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	287	14.64%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	108	5.51%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	25	1.28%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	9	0.46%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	7	0.36%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	1,960		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

As alluded to above, the area has a much higher proportion of larger family households than the city average across all 3 -8 person categories

Housing Policy Implications

As suggested at 2. Household Composition above

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)	854	161	952			1,967
	43.41%	8.18%	48.39%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	871	136	937	2	14	1,960
	44.43%	6.94%	47.80%			
CITY						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates	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

There has been very little change in tenure. Even the proportion of private rented houses has not risen at the same rate as comparable neighbourhoods

Housing Policy Implications

The main issue has been the lack of any new housing development to help boost population

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	51	2.60%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	499	25.46%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	553	28.21%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	838	42.75%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	16	0.82%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	3	0.15%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	0	0.00%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	0	0.00%	630	0.22%
	1,960		285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

The neighbourhood contains a high proportion of family dwellings in semi detached and terrace form

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	2.43	2.02

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

	N/hood	City
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	1,216	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	1,157	95.14%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	47	3.86%
Over 1.5 persons per room	12	0.98%
	1,216	

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	1960	451	579	1030	52.55	668	262	13.37
Owned	873	290	308	598	68.5	202	73	8.36
Private rented or living rent free	150	24	46	70	46.66	55	25	16.66
Social rented	937	137	225	362	38.63	411	164	17.5
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 greater than the city

A average

There is slightly higher density of population per household compared to other neighbourhoods despite the high proportion of family

B accommodation

Underoccupation is higher in all tenures. However in spite of apparently high density, levels of

C overcrowding are lower than the city averages.

Housing Policy Implications

Smaller households in larger dwellings may require support and/or the option to move to a smaller property

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	N/hood	City	City
7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)				
Occupied household spaces		1,851		
Occupied household spaces with no central heating	19	0.96%	11,379	3.98%

7. HEATING TYPE

Commentary

Only a very small number of properties did not have central heating at the time of the Census

Housing Policy Implications

There is likely to be a high level of fuel poverty in the area

Stock should be assessed in terms of energy efficiency by owners and landlords

8 VACANT PROPERTIES (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

<i>Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties</i>	N/hood	N/hood	City
All Household spaces		1,978	293,876
Vacant household spaces	18	0.91%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	0	0.00%	0.19%
Occupied	1960	99.08%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES

Commentary

Properties appear to be in high demand

Housing Policy Implications

None

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood **4,767**

A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	639	13.40%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	485	9.60%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	3,643	76.42%	79.43%

B Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	3,240	67.96%	69.01%
Physical disability	371	7.78%	7.82%
Mental health condition	291	6.10%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	290	6.08%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	100	2.09%	2.49%
Learning disability	34	0.71%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	117	2.45%	2.14%
Development disorder	44	0.92%	0.64%
C Provision of Care in a household			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	170	3.56%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	125	2.62%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	190	3.98%	2.88%
D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household	328	9.53%	8.43%

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

There is a higher than average proportion of the **A** population whose day to day activities are limited
 N/hood residents have similar long term health **B** issues as found in the rest of the city
 N/hood residents affected more likely to require shorter term unpaid care of between 20 and 50 **C** hours per week

A higher than average proportion of the population are long term sick or disabled than the 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 in terms of residents requiring to be discharged from hospital

ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census

A Neighbourhood Profiles)

Ethnic Origin

	Frequency	N/hood	City
White British or Irish	4,449	93.32%	84.56%
White Other	92	1.92%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	12	0.25%	0.48%
Indian	29	0.61%	1.46%
Pakistani	92	1.92%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	0	0.00%	0.08%
Chinese	22	0.46%	1.79%
Other Asian	18	0.38%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	33	0.69%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	20	0.42%	0.64%

CENSUS PROFILE SUMMARY	N/hood	City
4,767		

B Country of Birth

Born outside UK	231	4.84%	12.24%
-----------------	-----	-------	---------------

C Spoken English

Does not speak English well or at all	56	1.17%	2.59%
---------------------------------------	----	-------	--------------

10. ETHNICITY

Commentary

Higher proportion of White (British or Irish) than city

A as a whole

Lower proportion of residents born outside UK than

B rest of city

The proportion of non-English speakers is lower

C compared to the rest of the city

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	64.55%	64.49%
Economically inactive	35.45%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	10.84%	9.05%
Full time students	8.40%	13.73%
Retired	11.57%	11.32%

12 Car Ownership

	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or van:	49.85%	49.18%

Commentary

The Neighbourhood is close to the city average in regard to the population in employment, a low student population living at home and also a similar proportion of retired persons under 74 years of age compared to the average. Car ownership rates are very close to the city average

From a housing affordability perspective, those residents who have never worked or are long term unemployed is slightly above the city average

