

GOVANHILL 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		2,446	10,325	1,594	14,365
	N/hood %		17.03%	71.88%	11.10%	
	cf city %		16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES		Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency		2,678	10,092	1,582	14,352
	N/hood %		18.66%	70.32%	11.02%	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

Commentary

Total population **decrease** of 13
 Higher proportion of children in the area than compared to the city average

Housing Policy Implications

In spite of the estimated fall in population, demand for family housing is likely to continue to grow, especially if there are hidden overcrowding households. Housing providers should consider increasing the supply.

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood **7,411**

GLASGOW'S HOUSING STRATEGY 2017 - 2022 : NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILES

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	727	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.76%	
Proportion of all households	9.80%	14.46%

B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	445	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.68%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	61.21%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%

C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,423	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.17%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	19.20%	22.96%

D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,002	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.06%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	13.52%	16.96%

Single person households over 65	788	36,508
(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbourhood)		
% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.16%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	10.63%	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	3122	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	42.12%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

The neighbourhood has one of the lowest proportions of **A** single parent families in the city

This is also reflected in the below average percentage of **B** single parent households who have dependent children

By contrast the neighbourhood contains one of the highest concentrations of households with dependent **C** children overall

The neighbourhood has a below average proportion of **D** single households over 65 years of age

The neighbourhood has a significantly higher proportion **E** of single person households under the age of 65

Housing Policy Implications

A review of household composition confirms the pattern of rising child population, but also shows that the area is attractive to forming single person households of working age

This suggests a high demand for smaller properties in addition to larger family dwellings

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency N/hood		City
Occupied by One person	3,910	52.76%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	1,860	25.10%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	701	9.45%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	492	6.64%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	275	3.71%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	94	1.27%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	45	0.60%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	34	0.45%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	7,411		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

As anticipated from the review of household composition, at the time of the Census, the neighbourhood contained a significantly higher proportion of one person households than the city average. Significantly, there was also a higher proportion of 5 person plus households. This coupled with the fact that there were proportionately fewer 2 - 4 person households suggests that families living in current accommodation are larger or have been extended. The other possibility is that there are a higher number of adult households sharing accommodation.

Housing Policy Implications

Social surveys to determine current household composition were been carried out in 2015, and work is ongoing to address overcrowding and deal with ownership and property factoring issues

4 HOUSING TENURE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	Owner Occupied	Private Rented	Social Rented	Shared ownershi p	Rent free	Total
NEIGHBOURHOOD	2,583	2,768	2,516			7,867
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates)	32.83%	35.19%	31.98%			

TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	2,690	2,102	2,521	27	71	7,411
	36.29%	28.36%	34.00%			
CITY						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates an	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 balance between the three tenures was at 2014 roughly one third of total supply for each (owner occupied, private rented and social rented) which is a distinctly different pattern from the majority of neighbourhoods in the city where either social rented or owner occupation tend to dominate.

However, it is significant that between 2011 and 2014, the proportion of owner occupiers fell and was replaced directly by an increase in the proportion of private rented properties (up by nearly 7% from an already high proportion)

Housing Policy Implications

Issues associated with negative aspects of private renting are being addressed through a Council-Scottish Government initiative.

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	59	0.79%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	212	2.86%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	290	3.91%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	6,662	89.98%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	144	1.94%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	13	0.17%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	5	0.06%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	26	0.35%	630	0.22%
	7,411		285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

9 in every 10 properties in the neighbourhood are tenements, which reflects the inner city nature of this suburb, which was relatively untouched by the major redevelopment of similar areas in the 1950s and 60s

Housing Policy Implications

It is unlikely that the average size of a tenement property will fit the obvious demand for larger family accommodation, which suggests that additional supply of larger dwellings in a non tenemental form would go towards meeting some of the housing need. This is dependent on site availability, ground conditions and development funding.

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	City
A Average Household size	1.92	2.02

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

	N/hood	City
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	5,477	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	5,043	92.00%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	303	5.53%
Over 1.5 persons per room	131	2.39%

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	7411	612	1753	2365	31.91	3053	1993	26.89
Owned	2717	377	858	1235	45.45	993	489	18
Private rented or living rent free	2173	114	348	462	21.26	898	813	37.41
Social rented	2521	121	547	668	26.49	1162	691	27.41
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 smaller in the neighbourhood reflecting the high number of single

A households

In spite of this, density per room is significantly

B higher than the city average.

Overcrowding is particularly high in the private rented sector, but there is also higher than average overcrowding in the social rented sector. The highest levels of underoccupation are to be found in the owner occupied sector, but this is considerably lower

C than the city average for that tenure

Housing Policy Implications

This assessment confirms the view that there is a shortage of bedrooms to meet the current demand, and suggests that additional larger accommodation is required

(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 with no central heating	576	7.77%	11,379	3.98%

7. HEATING TYPE

Commentary

The neighbourhood has one of the highest proportions of stock without central heating

Housing Policy Implications

Coupled with the fact that the majority of properties are pre-1919 tenements, efforts need to be made to comprehensively address lack of heating, insulation and the likelihood of fuel poverty

8 VACANT PROPERTIES (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties

	N/hood	N/hood	City
All Household spaces		7,751	293,876
Vacant household spaces	333	4.29%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	7	0.09%	0.19%
Occupied	7411	95.61%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES

Commentary

In spite of apparently high demand, the neighbourhood had, at the time of the Census, one of the highest vacancy rates in the city

Housing Policy Implications

Housing providers need to determine why there was/is high vacancy.

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood	14,365		
A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	1,766	12.29%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	1,471	10.24%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	11,128	77.46%	79.43%
B Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	10,061	70.03%	69.01%
Physical disability	1,066	7.42%	7.82%
Mental health condition	1,126	7.84%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	735	5.11%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	340	2.36%	2.49%
Learning disability	76	0.53%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	264	1.84%	2.14%
Development disorder	73	0.51%	0.64%
C Provision of Care in a household			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	511	3.56%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	250	1.74%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	383	2.66%	2.88%
D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household	1,091	7.59%	8.43%

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

There are higher proportions of the population

A whose day to day activities are limited

The proportion of residents with no significant medical condition is in line with the city average.

Sensory impairment and physical disability rates are generally lower than the city average, though mental

B health is slightly higher

Levels of unpaid care are slightly lower than the city

C average

The proportion of residents with long term sickness

D or a disability are lower than the city average

Housing Policy Implications

The relatively high proportion of people whose activities are limited is somewhat at odds with the pattern of long term sickness and disability

It may be that those lacking personal mobility are concentrated in particular parts of the neighbourhood, such as the Eastern end of the neighbourhood where most of the social rented stock is concentrated

CENSUS
PROFILE
SUMMAR
Y N/hood City

ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census

A Neighbourhood Profiles)

Ethnic Origin

	Frequency		
White British or Irish	8,713	60.65%	84.56%
White Other	895	6.23%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	118	0.82%	0.48%
Indian	401	2.79%	1.46%
Pakistani	3,093	21.53%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	26	0.18%	0.08%
Chinese	127	0.88%	1.79%
Other Asian	474	3.29%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	343	2.38%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	175	1.22%	0.64%
	14,365		

B Country of Birth

Born outside UK	4,068	28.32%	12.24%
-----------------	-------	--------	---------------

C Spoken English

Does not speak English well or at all	972	6.76%	2.59%
---------------------------------------	-----	-------	--------------

10. ETHNICITY

Commentary

The neighbourhood is the most ethnically diverse in the city by some distance, containing the lowest proportion of White British or Irish, the highest White Other population, and one of the largest Pakistani populations. Other ethnic groups are also well represented, with the exception of the Chinese population which is lower than

A the city average.

The neighbourhood has the highest proportion of

B residents born outwith the UK

The neighbourhood has the highest proportion of non-

C English speakers in the city

Housing Policy Implications

A number of projects and initiatives are already in place to encourage integration and community education. In housing terms, communication may be the main challenge for housing providers in terms of assessing and meeting housing need and addressing specific property related issues arising within the tenement stock.

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	63.26%	64.49%
Economically inactive	36.74%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	12.65%	9.05%
Full time students	12.25%	13.73%
Retired	9.30%	11.32%

12 Car Ownership

	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or vans	38.49%	49.18%

Commentary

The neighbourhood has a slightly below average proportion of its population in employment, but has a relatively high proportion of students living at home. The neighbourhood has a lower than average proportion of retired persons under 74 years of age. There is also lower than average car ownership

From a housing affordability perspective, those residents who have never worked or who are long term unemployed is 3 percentage points higher than the city average

