

IBROX & KINGSTON 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		1,392	9,380	1,175	11,947
	N/hood %		11.65%	78.51%	9.84%	
	cf city %		16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES		Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency		1,586	9,603	1,207	12,396
	N/hood %		12.79%	77.47%	9.73%	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

Commentary

Total population **increase** of 449 (3.76%)
 High proportion of working age in the area compared with the city as a whole. Much lower proportion of children and over 65s in the population

Housing Policy Implications

The neighbourhood is clearly popular with working age households. The question is whether or not there is sufficient supply and whether or not other household types can be attracted to the area

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood **6,144**

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	568	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	9.24%	
Proportion of all households	1.37%	14.46%

B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	366	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.38%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	64.44%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households	5.96%	64.17%

C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	939	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.43%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	15.28%	22.96%

D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	611	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.26%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	9.94%	16.96%

Single person households over 65	480	36,508
(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbourhood)		
% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.31%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	7.81%	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	2,545	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	41.42%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

The N/hood has a lower percentage of lone parent

A households than the city average

The number of lone parent households with dependent

B children is also lower than the city average

The proportion of households in the N/hood with

C dependent children is lower than the city as a whole

The proportion of households over 65 in the N/hood is

D lower than the city average.

The proportion of single person households under 65 is

E significantly higher than the city average

Housing Policy Implications

As allude to above there is a case to be made to try to attract a wider diversity of household types into this area

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	3,025	49.24%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	1,947	31.69%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	660	10.74%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	298	4.85%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	146	2.38%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	41	0.67%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	17	0.28%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	10	0.16%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	6,144		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

The proportion of one and two person households is higher than the city as a whole

Housing Policy Implications

There is a need to attract larger households into the neighbourhood to create balance and make the area more attractive to family households

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)	2,423	2,805	1,461			6,689
	36.22%	41.93%	21.84%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	2,234	2,276	1,536	21	77	6,144
	36.36%	37.04%	25.00%	0.34%	1.25%	
CITY						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates a Stock Change Comparator 2009/2014)	128,641	60,465	107,167	N/A	N/A	296,273
	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

Proportion of those living in the private rented sector in the n/hood is the highest in the city and has increased over the past few years.

Housing Policy Implications

Based upon similar levels of growth in other parts of the city, the area is likely to require some intervention to ensure that the quality and standard of housing is improved. This may also mean some form of management intervention to protect owners and tenants

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	40	0.65%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	159	2.59%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	372	6.05%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	5,401	87.91%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	97	1.58%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	65	1.06%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	4	0.07%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	6	0.10%	630	0.22%
	6,144		285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

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

Housing Policy Implications

The quality of tenemental stock should be considered, given the likely proportions which are in mixed ownership and without established factoring arrangements

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

A Average Household size

N/hood	City
1.84	2.02

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

	N/hood	City
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	4,480	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	4,296	95.89%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	114	2.54%
Over 1.5 persons per room	70	1.56%
	4,480	

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	6144	599	1708	2307	37.55	2567	1270	20.67
Owned	2255	339	775	1114	49.4	811	330	14.63
Private rented or living rent free	2353	144	576	720	30.6	1050	583	24.77
Social rented	1536	116	357	473	30.79	706	357	23.24
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 less than the city average
Proportion of those not sharing bedrooms is lower

B in the N/hood than the city as a whole
Levels of overcrowding do not appear to be high.
This may be due to the area having larger than
average proportion of tenements containing two or

C more bedrooms

Housing Policy Implications

At the moment supply and demand for current stock are in balance. However, the quality of the housing stock should be examined

(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
	6,144		
380	6.18%	11,379	3.98%

7. HEATING TYPE

Commentary

Larger proportion of households in the N/hood without central heating than the city as a whole

Housing Policy Implications

Given the tenure mix it is likely that the prevalence of central heating will be lower than elsewhere in the city. There is also likely to be less take up of insulation grant and higher levels of fuel poverty given the cost of heating larger tenement flats with high ceilings. The level of fuel poverty should be estimated and solutions to reduce heat loss considered

8 VACANT PROPERTIES (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties

	N/hood	N/hood	City
All Household spaces		6,501	293,876
Vacant household spaces	348	5.35%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	9	0.14%	0.19%
Occupied	6,144	94.51%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES

Commentary

Larger percentage of vacant spaces in the N/hood

Housing Policy Implications

Given the population growth and apparent demand for the area, the reasons for the numbers and proportion of vacant properties need to be investigated. This could be the result of properties which are uninhabitable or have high housing and fuel costs

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood	11,947		
A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	1,349	11.29%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	1,008	8.44%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	9,590	80.27%	79.43%
B Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	8,610	72.07%	69.01%
Physical disability	770	6.45%	7.82%
Mental health condition	825	6.91%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	545	4.56%	6.08%
Blindness or partial sight loss	242	2.03%	2.49%
Learning disability	64	0.54%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	289	2.42%	2.14%
Development disorder	58	0.49%	0.64%
C Provision of Care in a household			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	384	3.21%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	164	1.37%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	236	1.98%	2.88%
D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household	777	6.50%	8.43%

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

N/hood residents have slightly better mobility than

A the city average

N/hood residents typically have less long term

B conditions than in the rest of the city

N/hood residents affected more likely to require

C shorter term unpaid care of 1 to 19 hours a week

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

D city average

Housing Policy Implications

None at present

CENSUS
PROFILE
SUMMAR
Y N/hood City

ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census

A Neighbourhood Profiles)

Ethnic Origin

White British or Irish

White Other

Mixed or multiple ethnic groups

Indian

Pakistani

Bangladeshi

Chinese

Other Asian

African, Caribbean or Black

Other ethnic group

Frequency

8,414	70.43%	84.56%
693	5.80%	3.87%
64	0.54%	0.48%
683	5.72%	1.46%
1,034	8.65%	3.78%
10	0.08%	0.08%
232	1.94%	1.79%
213	1.78%	0.94%
501	4.19%	2.40%
103	0.86%	0.64%
11,947		

B Country of Birth

Born outside UK	2,770	23.19%	12.24%
-----------------	-------	--------	---------------

C Spoken English

Does not speak English well or at all	463	3.88%	2.59%
---------------------------------------	-----	-------	--------------

10. ETHNICITY

Commentary

Despite being predominantly White UK and Irish, the neighbourhood has a more mixed population than most neighbourhoods. There are a large number of other ethnic communities such as Indian and Pakistani as well

A as African, Caribbean and Black residents.

The proportion of those who were born outside of the

B UK is significantly higher than the city average.

There is also a large number of residents in the N/hood

C that cannot speak English well, or at all.

Housing Policy Implications

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	67.95%	64.49%
Economically inactive	32.05%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	10.60%	9.05%
Full time students	17.18%	13.73%
Retired	7.14%	11.32%

12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or vans	42.69%	49.18%

Commentary

The neighbourhood has an above average proportion of its population in employment, and a very high proportion of students domiciled. The neighbourhood has a below 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 just above the city average

