

KINGSPARK & MOUNT FLORIDA 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		1,486	6,704	1,309	9,499
	Neibhd %		15.64%	70.58%	13.78%	
	cf city %		16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES		Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency		1,509	6,735	1,368	9,612
	Neibhd %		15.70%	70.07%	14.23%	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT
Commentary
 Total population **increase** of 113 (1.2%)
 Slightly lower than average child population

Housing Policy Implications
 None

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood **4,467**

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	446	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.08%	
Proportion of all households	9.98%	14.46%

B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	294	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.11%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	65.92%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	6.58%	64.17%
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households	0.71%	

C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,030	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.57%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	23.06%	22.96%

D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	788	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.63%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	17.64%	16.96%

Single person households over 65 539 36,508

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

% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.48%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	12.07%	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	1,211	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	27.11%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

The Nhood has a lower percentage of lone parent
A households compared to the city average

The proportion of lone parent households with
dependent children is slightly higher than the city
B average

The proportion of households in the Nhood with
dependent children is slightly higher than the city as a
C whole

The proportion of households over 65 in the Nhood is
D similar to the city average

The proportion of single person households under 65
E is lower than the city average

Housing Policy Implications

None

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	1,750	39.18%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	1,452	32.51%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	566	12.67%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	465	10.41%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	169	3.78%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	45	1.01%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	15	0.34%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	5	0.11%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	4,467		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

Higher proportion of households occupied by more than one person, suggesting this neighbourhood contains more family households

Housing Policy Implications

None

4 HOUSING TENURE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

NEIGHBOURHOOD	Owner	Private	Social	Shared	Rent free	Total
	Occupied	Rented	Rented	ownershi p		
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates)	3,006 65.60%	1,180 25.75%	396 8.64%			4,582
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	3,177 71.12%	841 18.83%	416 9.31%	6 0.13%	27 0.60%	4,467
CITY						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimate:	128,641 43.40%	60,465 20.40%	107,167 36.39%	N/A	N/A	296,273
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	128,436 44.95%	48,019 16.80%	104,811 36.68%	1,781 0.62%	2,646 0.93%	285,693

4. HOUSING TENURE CHANGE

Commentary

Significantly higher proportion of home owners in the Nhood than the city average. There is also more private renting than social renting, which is below the city average

Housing Policy Implications

The substantial increase in the proportion of privately rented properties and the fall in social rented provision probably reflects the city wide swing to private renting over the last 6 or 7 years. It is likely that a proportion of those tenants renting privately may have opted for a social rented tenancy, However the lack of supply in the social rented sector may be forcing tenants to use up a high proportion of their disposable income. It is recommended that if sites can be found for new social rented provision, these should be developed.

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	Nhood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	41	0.92%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	572	12.81%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	718	16.07%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	3,054	68.37%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	78	1.75%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	3	0.07%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	1	0.02%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	0	0.00%	630	0.22%
	4,467		285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

Majority of residents in the Nhood are living in tenemental stock. However at the King's Park end, there is an established suburban settlement.

There is a higher proportion of Nhood residents living in terraced properties, compared to the city average

Housing Policy Implications

The provision of more family houses and even some higher density properties may have the effect of accelerating population growth.

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

A Average Household size

N/hood	City
2.12	2.02

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

	N/hood	City
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	3,181	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	3,093 97.23%	96.5%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	73 2.29%	2.52%
Over 1.5 persons per room	15 0.47%	0.95%

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	4467	1413	1283	2696	60.35	1254	517	11.57
Owned	3183	1312	926	2238	70.31	692	253	7.95
Private rented or living rent free	868	83	240	323	37.21	380	165	19
Social rented	416	18	117	135	32.45	182	99	23.8
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

Higher average household size in the Nhood

A compared to the city

Slightly higher proportion of those not sharing

B bedrooms compared to the city average

Underoccupation is well above the city average except in the social rented sector which also has

C higher levels of overcrowding

Housing Policy Implications

Any new social rented provision should give due weight to meeting the needs of larger households

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	N/hood	City	City
7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)				
Occupied household spaces		4,467		
Occupied household spaces with no central heating	176	3.94%	11,379	3.98%

7. HEATING TYPE
Commentary
 Proportion of households living without central heating is in line with the city average

Housing Policy Implications
 Pre 1919 tenemental stock is likely to require some form of insulation and low density householders should be encouraged to improve insulation

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		4,558	293,876
Vacant household spaces	82	1.80%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	9	0.20%	0.19%
Occupied	4,467	98.00%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES
Commentary
 Vacancy rate is similar to the city average

Housing Policy Implications
 None. Neighbourhood appears to be in demand

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood	9,499		
A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	761	8.01%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	849	8.94%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	7,889	83.05%	79.43%
B Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	6,938	73.04%	69.01%
Physical disability	497	5.23%	7.82%
Mental health condition	422	4.44%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	565	5.95%	6.08%
Blindness or partial sight loss	170	1.79%	2.49%
Learning disability	33	0.35%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	151	1.59%	2.14%
Development disorder	57	0.60%	0.64%
C Provision of Care in a household			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	531	5.59%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	152	1.60%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	236	2.48%	2.88%
D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household	304	3.20%	8.43%

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

Nhood residents have better mobility compared
A to the city average

Nhood residents typically have less long term
B conditions than in the rest of the city

Nhood 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
D lower than the city average

Housing Policy Implications

No obvious issues at present. However in time
older people living in tenements may require
housing related support such as adaptations or a
move to a ground floor property

	CENSUS PROFILE SUMMAR Y	N/hood	City
ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census A Neighbourhood Profiles)			
Ethnic Origin	Frequency		
White British or Irish	8,483	89.30%	84.56%
White Other	247	2.60%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	34	0.36%	0.48%
Indian	69	0.73%	1.46%
Pakastani	465	4.90%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	1	0.01%	0.08%
Chinese	79	0.83%	1.79%
Other Asian	48	0.51%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	58	0.61%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	15	0.16%	0.64%
	9,499		
B Country of Birth			
Born outside UK	760	8.00%	12.24%
C Spoken English			
Does not speak English well or at all	144	1.52%	2.59%

10. ETHNICITY

Commentary

With the exception of the Pakistani community, most ethnic groups are under-represented in the

A neighbourhood

Lower proportion of residents born outside UK than

B rest of city

The proportion of non-English speakers is lower than

C the city average

Housing Policy Implications

The neighbourhood has the potential to become more ethnically diverse

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	73.27%	64.49%
Economically inactive	26.73%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	4.96%	9.05%
Full time students	8.59%	13.73%
Retired	12.56%	11.32%

12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or van	63.06%	49.18%

Commentary

The neighbourhood has a well above average proportion of its population in employment. There is a lower proportion of students living at home. The neighbourhood has a slightly higher average proportion of retired persons under 74 years. There is also a significantly higher level of car ownership

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

