

GREATER GOVAN 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		2,200	8,939	1,814	12,953
	N/hood %		16.98%	69.01%	14.00%	
	cf city %		16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES		Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency		2,589	9,572	1,829	13,990
	N/hood %		18.51%	68.42%	13.07%	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

Commentary

Total population **increase of 1037 (8%)**

There have been increases in working age and child populations. The number of residents over 65 has remained constant

Housing Policy Implications

Demand is clearly growing, suggesting that new housing supply will be required, especially for family households

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood **6,746**

GLASGOW'S HOUSING STRATEGY 2017 - 2022 : NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILES

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,164	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.82%	
Proportion of all households	17.25%	14.46%

B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	777	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.93%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	66.75%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households	1.88%	64.17%

C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,569	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.39%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	23.26%	22.96%

D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,118	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	16.57%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	2.31%	16.96%

Single person households over 65	908	36,508
---	-----	--------

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

% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	13.46%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	2.49%	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	2,390	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	35.43%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

The N/hood has a larger percentage of lone parent **A** households compared to the city average

The number of lone parent households with **B** dependent children is also higher than the city average
Households in the N/hood with dependent children is **C** higher than the city average

The proportion of households over 65 in the N/hood is **D** in line with the city average.

The proportions of single person households in the N/hood both under and over 65 are slightly higher **E** than the city average

Housing Policy Implications

Despite a growing population, there is likely to be pressure on child centred housing provision.

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	3,298	48.89%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	1,853	27.47%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	907	13.45%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	455	6.74%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	177	2.62%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	33	0.49%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	18	0.27%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	5	0.07%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	6,746		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

Significantly larger proportion of single person households in the N/hood compared to the city as a whole

Housing Policy Implications

The neighbourhood appears to be popular with emerging households. The question is whether or not housing is of the right type and is affordable

4 HOUSING TENURE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

NEIGHBOURHOOD	Owner	Private	Social	Shared	Rent free	Total
	Occupied	Rented	Rented	ownership		
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates)	2,208	720	4,485			7,413
	29.78%	9.71%	60.50%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	2,073	545	3,986	101	41	6,746
	30.73%	8.08%	59.09%	1.50%	0.61%	
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

Home ownership has increased in the area over the past few years, however it is still below the city average

The social rented sector in the N/hood is significantly higher than the city as a whole. There is a case to be made for expansion of provision in other tenures

Housing Policy Implications

There is an opportunity to meet both local and external demand through the East Govan Transformational Regeneration Area. Careful consideration needs to be given to the proposed tenure mix and ways in which private sector resources can be used to meet unmet need.

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	110	1.63%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	748	11.09%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	973	14.42%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	4,786	70.95%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	76	1.13%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	18	0.27%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	6	0.09%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	29	0.43%	630	0.22%
	6,746		285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

Majority of the N/hood are living in tenemental stock, which is a similar proportion to the city as a whole

Housing Policy Implications

A greater proportion of new build in the form of lower density housing is required

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	City
A Average Household size	1.90	2.02

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

	N/hood	City
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	4,835	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	4,692	97.04%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	103	2.13%
Over 1.5 persons per room	40	0.83%
	4,835	

C Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy ²

(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	6746	949	1844	2793	41.4	2612	1341	19.88
Owned	2174	634	783	1417	65.18	533	224	10.3
Private rented or living rent free	586	70	146	216	36.86	239	131	22.35
Social rented	3986	245	915	1160	29.1	1840	986	24.73
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 less than the city

A average

Proportion of those not sharing bedrooms is

B higher in the N/hood than the city as a whole

There is evidence of overcrowding in the social

C rented sector

Housing Policy Implications

There is a need to provide larger family housing especially in the social rented sector

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	N/hood	City	City
7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)				
Occupied household spaces		6,746		
Occupied household spaces with no central heating	227	3.36%	11,379	3.98%

7. HEATING TYPE

Commentary

The proportion of those living without central heating is lower in the N/hood than the city average

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		6,885	293,876
Vacant household spaces	136	1.98%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	3	0.04%	0.19%
Occupied	6,746	97.98%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES

Commentary

Vacancy rate is similar to 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 **12,953**

A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	2,081	16.07%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	1,452	11.21%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	9,420	72.72%	79.43%

B Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	8,297	64.05%	69.01%
Physical disability	1,281	9.89%	7.82%
Mental health condition	1,128	8.71%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	997	7.70%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	461	3.56%	2.49%
Learning disability	114	0.88%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	299	2.31%	2.14%
Development disorder	78	0.60%	0.64%
C Provision of Care in a household			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	430	3.32%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	295	2.28%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	441	3.40%	2.88%
D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household	1,173	9.06%	8.43%

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

N/hood residents have significantly poorer

A mobility than city average

N/hood residents have more long term health

B issues than city as a whole

N/hood residents affected more likely to require

C longer term paid care of 50 hours+ per week

The proportion of the population which is reported as being long term sick or disabled is

D higher 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 for residents requiring to be discharged from hospital

	CENSUS PROFILE SUMMARY	N/hood	City
ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census A Neighbourhood Profiles)			
Ethnic Origin	Frequency		
White British or Irish	11,106	85.74%	84.56%
White Other	741	5.72%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	46	0.36%	0.48%
Indian	130	1.00%	1.46%
Pakistani	204	1.57%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	5	0.04%	0.08%
Chinese	83	0.64%	1.79%
Other Asian	121	0.93%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	447	3.45%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	70	0.54%	0.64%
	12,953		
B Country of Birth			
Born outside UK	1,574	12.15%	12.24%
C Spoken English			
Does not speak English well or at all	439	3.39%	2.59%

10. ETHNICITY

Commentary

With the exception of the African, Caribbean and Black group, most ethnic groups are under-represented in the neighbourhood. However, the fact that the neighbourhood is close to the city average suggests

- A** the potential for further growth in diverse populations
- Similar proportion of residents born outside UK to that
- B** of the city as a whole.

- The proportion of non-English speakers is higher than
- C** the city average

Housing Policy Implications

The neighbourhood could well become a growth point for in-migrant and asylum seeker households

It is important that housing needs of these groups are understood and that support infrastructure is considered in terms of any future growth

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	63.84%	64.49%
Economically inactive	36.16%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	12.93%	9.05%
Full time students	7.70%	13.73%
Retired	11.92%	11.32%

12 Car Ownership

	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or vans:	42.42%	49.18%

Commentary

The neighbourhood has a slightly below average proportion of its population in employment, and a low proportion of students living at home. The neighbourhood has an 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.

