

CROOKSTON & SOUTH CARDONALD 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		1,359	5,138	1,668	8,165
	N/hood %		16.64%	62.93%	20.43%	
	cf city %		16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES		Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency		1,180	4,785	1,669	7,634
	N/hood %		15.46%	62.68%	21.86%	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

Commentary

Total population **decrease** of 531 (-6.5%) accounted for by a loss of child and working age populations

Housing Policy Implications

Efforts need to be made to attract younger households into the neighbourhood

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood **3,860**

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	590	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.42%	
Proportion of all households	15.28%	14.46%

B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	363	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.37%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	61.52%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%

C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	950	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.44%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	24.61%	22.96%

D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	950	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.96%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	24.61%	16.96%

Single person households over 65 679 36,508

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

% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.86%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	17.59%	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	907	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	23.49%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

A Lone parenthood is slightly above the city average
There is a slightly lower proportion of lone parent households with dependent children in the

B neighbourhood than the city average
There is a slightly higher proportion of households with dependent children compared to the city

C average
There is a significantly higher proportion of single

D households over 65

The proportion of younger single households is
E substantially lower than the city average

Housing Policy Implications

The neighbourhood is showing some signs of imbalance. In its population and household structure

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	1,586	41.08%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	1,151	29.82%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	553	14.32%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	431	11.16%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	110	2.84%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	18	0.47%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	6	0.15%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	5	0.13%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	3,860		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

Single occupancy rates are less than the city average with higher proportions of three and four person households

Housing Policy Implications

No obvious implications

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)	2,339	547	1077			3,963
	59.02%	13.80%	27.17%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	2,468	358	995	10	29	3,860
	63.94%	9.27%	25.78%	0.26%	0.75%	

CITY

TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimate	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

Total housing stock has increased, although population has declined. There has been an absolute increase in the supply of social rented housing.

Housing Policy Implications

No obvious implications.

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	105	2.72%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	590	15.28%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	444	11.50%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	2,686	69.58%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	30	0.78%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	3	0.07%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	0	0.00%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	2	0.05%	630	0.22%
	3,860	99.98%	285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

There area contains a high proportion of four in a block properties which are classed as tenements. There is also a higher proportion of semi detached properties.

Housing Policy Implications

None

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

A Average Household size

N/hood	City
2.08	2.02

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

Occupied Household count

Up to 0.5 persons per room

Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room

Over 1.5 persons per room

	N/hood	City
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	2,756	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	2,685 97.42%	96.5%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	45 1.63%	2.52%
Over 1.5 persons per room	26 0.94%	0.95%

C Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy

(Source: Census Table LC4106SC by Neighbourhood)

NEIGHBOURHOOD

All households

Owned

Private rented or living rent free

Social rented

All households	Occupancy rating +2 or more	Occupancy rating +1	Total Underoccupation	Underoccupied %	Occupancy rating 0	Occupancy rating -1 or less	Overcrowded %
3860	1190	1130	2320	60.1	978	562	14.56
2478	1056	815	1871	75.5	454	153	6.17
387	66	136	202	52.2	131	54	13.95
995	68	179	247	24.82	393	355	35.67

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

The average household size is very slightly above

A the city average

Densities are in line with city average and stock

B profile

Underoccupation rates are much higher than the city average with the exception of the social rented sector. Overcrowding rates are lower

C than the city average.

Housing Policy Implications

At some point, some of the ageing population will either require to move to smaller accommodation or seek housing or care support to enable them to remain as long as possible in their own home e.g. in the form of aids and adaptations.

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

	N/hood	N/hood	City	City
Occupied household spaces		3,820		
Occupied household spaces with no central heating	127	3.29%	11,379	3.98%

7. HEATING TYPE

Commentary

Although below the average there appears to be a relatively high proportion of properties still without central heating

Housing Policy Implications

In addition to the need to encourage more residents to have central heating installed it is likely that there will be fuel poverty particularly in relation to heating and insulating larger dwellings

8 VACANT PROPERTIES (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties

	N/hood	N/hood	City
All Household spaces		3,984	293,876
Vacant household spaces	120	3.01%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	4	0.10%	0.19%
Occupied	3860	96.88%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES

Commentary

Vacancy rate is higher than city average

Housing Policy Implications

The reasons for higher vacancy rates need to be explored. It is possible that at the time of the census, individuals were finding it difficult to sell their properties with vacant possession

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood	8,165		
A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	1,046	12.81%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	890	10.90%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	6,229	76.29%	79.43%
B Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	5,461	66.88%	69.01%
Physical disability	614	7.52%	7.82%
Mental health condition	474	5.80%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	628	7.69%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	239	2.93%	2.49%
Learning disability	51	0.62%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	146	1.79%	2.14%
Development disorder	50	0.61%	0.64%
C Provision of Care in a household			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	475	5.81%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	166	2.03%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	228	2.79%	2.88%
D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household	422	7.13%	8.43%

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

There are higher proportions of the population
A whose day to day activities are limited

Relative to other neighbourhoods long term
limiting illness and disabilities are less prevalent
B other than for hearing and eyesight

A slightly higher proportion of the population is
reliant on unpaid care, except for over 50 hours
C which is very slightly below the average

There is a lower proportion of the working age
population classifying themselves as long term
D sick or disabled compared to the city average

Housing Policy Implications

There is a mixed picture with regard to health in
the neighbourhood, however it looks as though a
gradually ageing population will require more
care and other support measures in the medium
to longer term

	CENSUS PROFILE SUMMARY	N/hood	City
ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census)			
A Neighbourhood Profiles)			
Ethnic Origin	Frequency		
White British or Irish	7,450	92.24%	84.56%
White Other	162	1.98%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	24	0.29%	0.48%
Indian	43	0.53%	1.46%
Pakistani	150	1.84%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	8	0.10%	0.08%
Chinese	66	0.81%	1.79%
Other Asian	46	0.56%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	195	2.38%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	21	0.26%	0.64%
	8,165		
B Country of Birth			
Born outside UK	565	6.92%	12.24%
C Spoken English			
Does not speak English well or at all	176	2.15%	2.59%

10. ETHNICITY

Commentary

With the exception of the African, Caribbean and Black group, most ethnic groups are under-

A represented in the neighbourhood

Lower proportion of residents born outside UK than

B 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 most 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	66.62%	64.49%
Economically inactive	33.38%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	6.88%	9.05%
Full time students	7.86%	13.73%
Retired	15.91%	11.32%

12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or vans	54.66%	49.18%

Commentary

The neighbourhood has an above average proportion of its population in employment and has a lower proportion of students living at home. The neighbourhood has a high proportion of retired persons under 74 years of age. There is a higher than average level of car ownership

From a housing affordability perspective, those residents who have never worked or who are long term unemployed is around two-thirds of the city average

