GREATER GORBALS 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	1,262	5,920	1,284	8,466
N/hood %	14.91%	69.93%	15.17%	
cf city %	16.12	70.03	13.85	

2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
Frequency	1,312	6,260	1,258	**8,830**
N/hood %	14.86%	70.89%	14.25%	
cf city %	16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT
Commentary
Total population **increase** of 364 (4.3%)

Housing Policy Implications
The neighbourhood appears to be growing, probably as a result of new housing being built in spite of reductions in stock due to demolition during the period.

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood   4,655

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS

	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	718	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.74%	
Proportion of all households	15.42%	14.46%

B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILD

	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	452	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.70%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	62.95%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%

C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	850	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.29%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	18.25%	22.96%

D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS

	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	888	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.83%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	19.07%	16.96%

Single person households over 65	742	36,508

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

% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.03%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	15.93%	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	1679	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	36.06%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

A The neighbourhood has a slightly above average proportion of single parent households

B The neighbourhood has a lower proportion of lone parent households with dependent children than the city average

C The overall proportion of households with dependent children is lower than the city average

D The neighbourhood has a higher proportion of single households over 65 compared to than the city average

E The neighbourhood also has a higher proportion of single under 65s compared to the city average

Housing Policy Implications

The neighbourhood appears to attract both families and singles regardless of age. This may be a function of the mixed tenure nature of the neighbourhood and the fact that there has been a considerable amount of investment in both social rented and private sectors in the last 20 years. It is likely that further investment in new stock will continue in the near future. However, the nature of demand and need should be quantified to ensure that this investment is targeted to meet that need.

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	2421	52.00%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	1358	29.17%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	508	10.92%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	257	5.52%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	81	1.74%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	18	0.39%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	10	0.21%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	2	0.04%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	**4,655**		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

As expected, the proportion of one person households is considerably higher than the city average.

Housing Policy Implications

There is likely to be demand for 2 person and larger family accommodation both internally and from outwith the neighbourhood

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)	1,287	746	2,801			4,834
	26.62%	15.43%	59.94%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	1,209	570	2,810	39	27	4,655
	25.97%	12.24%	60.36%			
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 social rented housing provision, but a small increase in the number of privately rented properties

Housing Policy Implications

Owner occupation remains below the city average, which may be a function of the fall off in private sector completions post 2008.

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	30	0.64%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	42	0.90%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	284	6.10%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	4,226	90.78%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	37	0.79%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	16	0.34%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	2	0.04%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	18	0.38%	630	0.22%
	4,655		**285,793**	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

The neighbourhood is overwhelmingly tenemental and a high proportion of these are classed as multi storey flats

Housing Policy Implications

Because of its close relationship to the city centre, the neighbourhood is popular and high density replacement for stock previously demolished has been a policy choice

Depending on the cost of acquiring remaining sites for residential purposes, the neighbourhood may benefit from the provision of lower density accommodation for larger families

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	City
A Average Household size	1.78	2.02

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates — **As a proportion of households counted**

		N/hood	City
Occupied Household count		3,461	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	3,345	96.65%	96.5.%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	83	2.40%	2.52%
Over 1.5 persons per room	33	0.95%	0.95%

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	4655	396	1437	1833	39.38	1920	902	19.37
Owned	1248	234	512	746	59.77	360	142	11.38
Private rented or living rent free	597	40	190	230	38.52	249	118	19.76
Social rented	2810	122	735	857	30.5	1311	642	22.85
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

A. Average household size is below the city average reflecting the higher proportion of relatively newly formed younger households associated with the private sector new build programme in the area of the late 1990s

B. Occupied household densities are in line with city averages

C. There is less underoccupation than is evident elsewhere in the city, reflecting the relatively good fit between household size and property size. There is less overcrowding in the private rented sector, but slightly more in the owner occupied sector. The level of overcrowding in the social rented sector is close to the city average

Housing Policy Implications

It is difficult to draw any conclusions from the position at the time of the Census. There has been specific public and voluntary sector intervention particularly at the Laurieston end of the neighbourhood which has been designated as a Transformational Regeneration Area, however it may be assumed that housing mix has been considered and negotiated to suit the needs of persons displaced as a result of the demolition of the Laurieston multi story flats

	N/hood	N/hood	City	City
7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)				
Occupied household spaces		4,655		
Occupied household spaces with no central heating	235	5.04%	11,379	3.98%

7. HEATING TYPE
Commentary
At the time of the Census the neighbourhood had a relatively high rate of properties lacking central heating

Housing Policy Implications
Properties still lacking central heating should be identified and all property types reviewed to assess whether additional insulation is required. There is likely to be a high level of fuel poverty within the social rented stock

8 VACANT PROPERTIES (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties	N/hood	N/hood	City
All Household spaces		**4,724**	**293,876**
Vacant household spaces	60	1.27%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	9	0.19%	0.19%
Occupied	4655	98.54%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES
Commentary
Vacancy rate is lower than the city average

Housing Policy Implications
None. Neighbourhood appears to be in high demand

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood   **8,466**

A Long term health/disability in a household

	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	1,470	17.36%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	974	11.50%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	6,022	71.13%	79.43%

B Long term health condition in a household

	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	5,410	63.90%	69.01%
Physical disability	946	11.17%	7.82%
Mental health condition	779	9.20%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	620	7.32%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	251	2.96%	2.49%
Learning disability	47	0.55%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	197	3.32%	2.14%
Development disorder	47	0.55%	0.64%

C **Provision of Care in a household**

1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	279	3.29%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	170	2.00%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	230	2.71%	2.88%

D **Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household**

	867	10.24%	8.43%

9. HEALTH & DISABLITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

A N/hood residents have significantly poorer mobility than city average

B N/hood residents have more long term health issues than city as a whole

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

D The proportion of the population which is reported as being long term sick or disabled is higher than the city average

Housing Policy Implications

Given the high proportion of tenements and multi story flats in the neighbourhood, it is likely that a higher than average proportion will require some form of housing related support to allow them to remain in their own homes in the future as the population ages. Attempts should be made to quantify this need at a local level

	CENSUS PROFILE SUMMARY	N/hood	City

A ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Ethnic Origin	Frequency		
White British or Irish	6,915	81.68%	**84.56%**
White Other	419	4.94%	**3.87%**
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	36	0.42%	**0.48%**
Indian	131	1.55%	**1.46%**
Pakistani	183	2.16%	**3.78%**
Bangladeshi	3	0.04%	**0.08%**
Chinese	149	1.76%	**1.79%**
Other Asian	111	1.31%	**0.94%**
African, Caribbean or Black	453	5.35%	**2.40%**
Other ethnic group	66	0.78%	**0.64%**
	8,466		

B Country of Birth

Born outside UK	1,356	16.01%	**12.24%**

C Spoken English

Does not speak English well or at all	272	3.21%	**2.59%**

10. ETHNICITY

Commentary

A Despite being predominantly White UK and Irish, the neighbourhood has a more mixed population than most neighbourhoods, perhaps reflecting the range and price of available property in the area, closeness to the city centre and the creation of family and kinship ties. It appears to be a desirable residential destination for a number of ethnic groups

B This is also reflected in the numbers of residents born outwith the UK which is 4 percentage points higher than the city average

C There appears to be a disproportionality high number of residents who struggle with written or spoken English

.

Housing Policy Implications

The proportion of non white and non British or Irish white is likely to increase over time, mainly housed through the private sector, although there may be pressure on local social rented providers' waiting and transfer lists for available stock to meet the needs of that population

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	**58.86%**	64.49%
Economically inactive	**41.14%**	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	**11.19%**	9.05%
Full time students	**12.42%**	13.73%
Retired	**12.73%**	11.32%

12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or var	**34.54%**	49.18%

Commentary

The Neighbourhood has a below average proportion of its population in employment, but has a relatively high proportion of students domiciled in the area. The neighbourhood has a slightly above average proportion of retired persons under 74 years of age in the city. 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 2 percentage points higher than the city average